

---

KOBE – GAC: New gTLDs Policy (1 of 3)  
Sunday, March 10, 2019 – 10:30 to 12:15 JST  
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

OLGA CAVALLI: Hello, colleagues. In a few minutes we will start with the session with the geographic names of. We will do a revision of what has been done at the Work Track 5 about geographic names so if you can take your seats that will be great. ...

(Standing by).

OLGA CAVALLI: Colleagues, let's have your seats and we will start. Thank you for the silence. Good morning. Hi there. Oh, that's very noisy. Paul could you close the door? Thank you so much. It looks like the real action is outside, so we will try to make this conversation not so boring, so thank you for being with us this morning. This is the working group of geographic names that in the last meetings we have devoted this part of the meeting to review of what has been happening in one of the cross-community working groups Work Track 5 about geographic names. This is an effort of the GNSO what's called a PDP, a policy development process, for future round of new gTLDs so what we have been doing is the GAC has been participating in this cross-community effort, and they had the fantastic idea of sending me to do that representation so I've been working with the group for the whole year. And I will let you know what has been happening, the summary of comments received, and all that. And it's a lot of information, and I prepare this document, this PowerPoint so you can have it as a

---

*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.*

reference. Perhaps for future revisions of the comments received because not all the comments have been processed. So, this is the general -- could you be so kind to close the door? Thank you because there's a lot of noise from outside. Thank you very much. Thank you. So, this Work Track 5 has a co-leadership by 4 co-leaders, one co-lead appointed by the GNSO, who is Martin... one co-lead appointed by the ccNSO and a bet language. One by the ALAC. It's Javier... and one colleague appointed by the GAC who is myself. And it's a sub-team of this PDP that the GNSO is working towards, a new round of new gTLDs so I see a lot of new faces in the GAC. You may know that there was a first round of new gTLDs -- you're leaving? You stay with me? That's great fantastic. Good to have company. And the PDP has different -- the work tracks so there are other 4 which have already I would say finished. They are not Work Tracks any more and this Work Track 5 was initiated later in the process of the PDP to address a concern that we know its important for governments, and also for companies who are the applicants of the -- of this new gTLDs we saw yesterday, the interaction about the case of .amazon, we have other cases that we are focusing on others that have different outcomes. Some were resolved. Some were just withdrawn. Some of them still go around. Like .amazon so it's important not only for governments but it's also for the applicants because they also need certainty in the rules. The Applicant Guide Book in 2012 shows some good outcomes, so the 1900 plus gTLDs requested, I think 1200 or 1300 are on line and working which is a good outcome but there were some conflicts so this work in the GAC was created to review the geographic names and find ways to suggest in the rules how this could be addressed to diminish the uncertainty and

lower the objections, are and conflicts that as we saw some already are still around. So, this slide I think I told everything about. If you want, you can still be a member of the Work Track 5 group. It's -- the work is almost very advanced, but you can still be observer, or a participant. Any one can join from any stakeholder group, or supporting organization, or advisory committee. Can we go to the next one? So, what is the group -- what is the scope of the Work Track 5? We are focussed on the high level the TLD so the do the to the right and to the right. We don't talk about second level of this is not the focus of this Work Track. Only top level. What focus also, 2 character for example the two-letter codes of the ccTLD they are for Argentina, .France is FR--? Thank you, .BR for Brazil, and so on. So it's the 2 letter combinations. Country and territory names, the 3166-1 list of the two-letter codes short and long forms of ISO list. Additional categories in some sections of the Applicant Guide Book for the new members of the GAC. AGB you will see that acronym several times. Applicant Guide Book was the kind of the tender book for the first round of new gTLDs in 2012. Capitol cities in the eyes so list subnational names. ISO 3166-2. You're noisy guys. Comfortable. UNESCO regions and names in the composition of micro-geographic regions and selected and other groupings. And this is new, this was not contemplated in the first Applicant Guide Book, other geographic names. Such as geographic features. Rivers, mountains valleys, lakes etcetera. And culturally significant terms related to geographic also known as non-AGB graphic. Why non-? Because these names were not contemplated in the rules of the Applicant Guide Book in 2012 so the other ones were contemplated but this last category which is listed in this, in this slide were not in the first

round. Any comments? Questions? It's okay, the speed of the translation is okay? Wave me. It's okay? Thank you, Sabrina. They suffer because I get too fast. Okay. So that's the scope of the Work Track 5. Let's go on. So, what happened? We have met during the whole year. We had calls every week, every 2 weeks. We issued a supplemental initial report. You may recall that we organized a webinar to review the report and organize how to make the comments. Many comments were received, 42 comments. There is a compilation. You can see it on-line. I can send you the link if you want. There is fantastic work done by ICANN staff. It's really a lot of work. A lot of information, and so they have compiled it in a very clever way, and also, they have included some color codes so when there is some agreement in the comments, they have lighted it with Green. When there is some concerns. They have lighted it with yellow. When there is no agreement it's red, and when there are new ideas. Not proposed in the original text it's blue. So at a glance you can have a sense of where is it going towards the comments? So what I will try to do today in this hour and 15 minutes is to somehow summarize the comments that we have received. I'm for getting anything? No. Any comments, questions? No. Okay. Can we go to the next one please Gulden? Hello? Thank you, Julia. So. Let's see, I have added this information I prepared for the webinar. But I thought it was okay to review it with you. What was the supplemental preliminary report about? Why I'm bringing this to you? Because the staff could do a summary of one part of the comments received so far. The rest has not been reviewed yet, or compiled yet. So, we will see the whole content of the supplemental preliminary report for you to have a reference and then we will go to the summary

of the comments. Okay. So, this is what was for public comments in December. So, there were recommendations one to 13. Very similar to what was included in the Applicant Guide Book of 2012. So, some in the community think that that was a good document. And part of it should be kept. So this is also open for comments, and it's the preliminary recommendations 1 to 13 which is what we will review today. Then there are options and proposals which were question 1 to question 9 and then there were questions for community input from 1 to 38 that. Part of the comments has not been compiled yet. That will be showed in future, perhaps we can show that compilation in Marrakesh.

So what I will try to summarize to you is general comments received from the community, and the comments received about the preliminary recommendations 1 to 13 from the Applicant Guide Book on 2012. Okay? So I will show you that recommendations very quickly. So for you to have them in mind. Next one please. Thank you. So these recommendations are reserve as unavailable at the top level, so this means that no applicant could request these strings contained in these categories. 2-character letter as key code combinations. Alpha three-letter codes listed in ISO3166-standard. This is the list of the ccTLD. Short or long form names listed in the ISO standard. Short or long form name as associated with codes that have been designated as exceptional reserved by the ISO 3166 maintenance agency. Separable components of country names designated in the separable country names list. Permutations and transposition recommendations suggest clarifying. Well there are some clarifications. Names by which a country is commonly known as. ... by evidence the country is recognized by that

---

name.

So as you see, these are all formal lists that have been used all for the ccTLDs or used by the countries or by the different organizations and are established by mainly by the international standard organizations. This was also a reserve in the first round and the proposition is to keep on reserving them in the new round. Okay. So far? No questions? No? Okay can we go to the next one please? So, other reserve names that require, would require -- that's not decided yet -- would require a letter of support or non-objection from the relevant governments or public authorities at the top level. Capitol city names of any countries or territories listed in the ISO 3166-1 for example. Buenos Aires. City names where the applicant declares that it intends to use the gTLD for purposes associated with the city name. See specific language from the 2012 Applicant Guide Book for details. Applications for any string that is exact match of a subnational place name such as a country province or state listed in the ISO 3166-2. Which is for example name in my country the provinces of the country. Applications for a string listed as UNESCO region or appearing in the composition of macro graphic regions geographical subregions selected economic or other groupings list. So this if an applicant would like to request these names and applicant would like to request .Buenos Aires should have a letter of the mayor or the government of the city of Buenos Aires, so he could have the population accepted. Okay. So these are the preliminary recommendations that were for public comments. What I will show to you very briefly is the rest of the sections of the document that were open for comments and then we will review these recommendations

---

comments. Can we go to the next one? This is for future comments.

These comments about these issues have not been compiled yet so this is a very summarized abbreviation of what the report included in the question one to question 9. I'm just including this here for your reference for future meetings that we will have in the next month. So these are the questions and proposals which were 11. Can we go to the next one please? So question 11 and then there were 38 proposals. I won't go into them because those comments have not been summarized, and reviewed so far. So we will review them in the future but I included them for reference. And if you remember we organized a webinar too, and we went one by one like in December before the closing of the comment period. Can we go to the next one please? So you have the full list. The next one. And there is another one so this is the full list of questions and proposals and we will review the preliminary recommendations only. So let's go to the preliminary recommendations one by one. So these comments about this have been compiled and I will try in this hour to summarize them. I'm not sure that I will get at the time, but you have the material in this PowerPoint.

This was a PowerPoint presented not exactly the same way, I just change and try to make it easier for you to see it on-line, and in the screen. But it's mainly prepared for the way -- for the session we had yesterday morning, if the Work Track 5 presented this to the community, and thanks to the staff that work with this very interesting PowerPoint that I briefly changed. So general comments. We won't

---

review the questions and the proposals because it's not compiled. Let's go to the next one Gulden, please. So preliminary findings general comments that different members of the community have sent about all the report and about the whole process in general. In general, there is support of the continuation of the 2012 implementation. So this document seems to be okay for most of the commenters. It seems there is value in keeping at least most of the recommendations in the Applicant Guide Book of the 2012. So that's a start. There are generally supportive of the continuation of the 2012 implementation with exception of the intended use provision aside to non-capitol city names.

What does intended use mean? Intended use mean that for example I would use benefit airs as the name of the city and not as Buenos Aires mean good air not as the name of a brand of air-conditioning so if the name of the brand of air-conditioning is the same as the city that is not intended use. It's not geographic intended use. It's different name. Used for a brand. I don't know if the example is good or not but it is something that came to my mind this morning. Maybe some other colleagues have other example. Have concerns about the basis for preventive protections. What is a preventive protection. If you need a letter of support for applying for the Buenos Aires that's a preventive protection. It could be the case that the rules don't need that letter, don't request that letter, but then if the name of the city is requested by the city government then the government of the city may have the opportunity to raise an objection. That would be a reaction, but not with a preventive measure. So preventive would be a letter required



---

from the government of the city or of the country, or of the subnational region. So there are some concerns about the basis for preventive protections. So some members think this is kind of a limitation for the applicants. For requesting these names, and some others think that it's good to have a letter of support from the government, or the city mayor or whoever it's the name related with. So I think that's it for the moment. Any comments so far? Questions? Am I going too fast Sabrina? No you're serious? Okay. Let's go to the next one.

Most of the general comments fell into those 3 main categories that I showed to you. There is another one that there is some opposition to preventive protection. So there were some comments saying well this letter of support are not needed. We just -- we would need just a reaction from the, from the government of the city or the region once the string is requested so it is no total agreement in having these preventive protections. And what else? Some noted in particular the brand TLD usage is unlikely to be confused with the geographic application. That depend on the name. Let's go to the next one, Gulten, please. Thank you. Now to specific list and recommendations that were in the Applicant Guide Book and see which were the comments and reactions from the community. So these terms reserved at the top level and not available for registration by any party. Let's see the comments about these reservations. Next please.

So recommendation number 1. Unless or until decided maintaining reservation of certain strings at the top level in upcoming processes to the delegate new gTLDs. Go to the substance. Certain strings may need

---

documentation of support or non-objection from the relevant government or public authorities as applicable. So the comments were the majority of the comments supported this restriction. Some divergence. Some opposed to this recommendation saying that this letter of support may not be needed. And some opposed to the reservation for in general but are still willing to support the recommendation, and there were no new ideas. As I said there was this category of new ideas because there were some comments that were out of the scope, and some of them were very valuable. Can we go to the next one please Gulden? Thank you.

The second one reserve all 2-character letter as key combinations at the top level for existing and future country codes. Not only the ones on the list but also 2 letter combinations. The majority of comments support this idea. Some do not believe that governments have an exclusive legal basis in geographic names but are still willing to support this recommendation. And few comments were opposed. Opposition to allowing one letter one digit so there is the idea of allowing numbers but it could be confusing like the one confused with the L or the O with the zero. So this -- there was some opposition to allow the combination of letter and numbers as 2 digit or one-digit strings and there were no new ideas. Next please Gulden.

So recommendations 3 is reserved the alpha three-letter code listed in the ISO 3166 standard which is the well known two-letter codes that is used for the ccTLDs. In general many comments support this restriction, some do not believe that governments have an exclusive

---

legal basis in geographic names but are willing to support the recommendation. Several comments oppose recommendation and believe that alpha three-letter codes on the ISO 3166-1 should be available. No new ideas. No other comments. So this is recommendations 3. Any comments? Questions? Remember what I'm trying to do is summarize the comments. You can go to the full document and have a detailed revision, and reading of all the comments with this color code that I told you a minute ago. So let's go to the -- this is -- did it change or not I didn't realize? They are so similar. Let's go to the next one.

This is -- oh this is new thank you. They are very similar. The long form name listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard. Similar to comments before the majority comments support this restriction. Some comments do not believe that governments have exclusive right on geographic names but are willing to support it, and some believe that the long form name of the ISO 3166-1 should be available. So very similar to the short form. This long form version. Next one Gulden please. Number 5. Okay short form name listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard. Very similar the majority support this restriction. Some believe that governments don't have the right on these geographic names, and very similar to the ones before. In general there is support of these restrictions. Keeping this restriction. Remember, that these were the restrictions in the applicant Guide book in the first round in 2012. Gulden can we go to number 6? Thank you very much. Restrictions to short or long form name association with the code that has been designated as exceptionally reserved by ISO 3166 maintenance agency. Very similar majority

---

support the restriction. Some believe that governments don't have that right. And they some believes that this long form names should be available. No new ideas. No other comments. Let's go to 7. Separable components of the country name designated on the separable country names list. ... list is included as appendix to the 2012 Applicant Guide Book. Majority of comments support this restriction. Some still believe that the governments don't have that right. And some think that this should be available. So very similar to the other ones. But I would say that most of the comments were in favor of keeping these restrictions. Let's go to number 8 because these are comments. You can review after. Okay this is a more long permutations so restrictions to permutations on transposition of any names included in items 1 through 5 permanent institutions include removal of spaces insertion of punctuation, and decision or removal of grammatical articles like the. A transposition is considered a change in the sequence of the long or short form of a name. For example republicCzech or islandsCayman. There is a request of clarification from the Work Track 5 about transpositions in different categories. I won't go into the detail. You can read it after. So the comments about this. Can we go to the next one Gulden please?

So there were similar to comments before in general there was support for maintaining this restriction. There were request of clarification related to some alpha three-letter codes. Some comments opposing transposition and permutations and one comment opposes transposition. New ideas for the deliberations. Several reserve permutations and transpositions of alpha 3. Ensure that executive

---

summary consists with an allowing permutations and transpositions of alpha 3. Revisions... of alpha three-letter codes listed in the ISO 3166 standard should be issued. At the highlighted phrase to make it strings resulting from permutations and transpositions. Standard and resulting string themselves should be allowed. So there is some suggested text to be changed in the outcomes of the comments. Number 9. Restrictions to name by which a country is commonly known. As demonstrated by evidence that the country is recognized by that name in an intergovernmental or treaty organization. Majority level of support. Some believed that governments don't have an exclusive right on these names. And some comments opposed the recommendation and believe that the -- by which a country is commonly known should be available. New ideas establish a dedicated procedure to detect and demonstrate respective evidence. So the applicant should show evidence of -- of the country name or I don't know. So that's, that's conflicting because the country names are important for the countries but at the same time, some believe that there are no legal basis for countries in having that restriction. Let's go to the following which is number 10.

So there is a different now category of recommendations. 10 to 13 are terms that in the Applicant Guide Book required letters of support from governments or relevant authorities. There is a slight difference with the lists before that were just not allowed. These are -- would be if the applicant presents a letter of support of the relevant government. So let's go to the next one, please.

Number 10 an application of any string that is a representation of the capitol city name of any country or territory listed in the eyes so 3166-1 standard. So, many commenters support this restriction. There's not a restriction. It's application that it would need the letter of support from the city mayor. At one comment does not believe that governments have that right. Similar to what was expressed before, and several comments opposed the recommendation and believe that no letter of support or non-objection should be needed. What's the idea behind this? No letter of support would be needed and then the city mayor or the city government authorities should go and file an objection, or go to a procedure to oppose to the requested string by an applicant. Let's go to the next one please.

10 continued new ideas. There was a suggested change in the text. I won't go into details because there's no reason to review text now. If a capitol city names continue to be protected they should be subject to intended use requirements. Again. Intended use for example, good or bad example I made about Buenos Aires if the applicant is going to use it with for example promoting the city itself as a geographic name, then they will need the letter of support. If they are going to use it for air-conditioning of good air like Buenos Aires in Spanish they would not need it. That would be the meaning of the intended use. Comments? Questions? You are silent. I mean I think I am making it very boring. Let's go to 11.

Remember this category is requesting letter of support and applicant for a city name where the applicant declares that it intends to use the

gTLD for purposes associated with the name. An application for a city name will be subject to the geographic name's requirements. Will require documentation of support or non-objection from the relevant governments or public authorities. It is clear from the applicant statements within the application that the applicant will use the TLD primarily for purposes associated with the city name. That will be the what I explained before. The apply for string is a city name as listed on official city documents, and additional detail is available in the document. So there is several support. And also there are some opposition and willing -- in supporting this restriction. This need of a letter of support for a city name. Let's go to the next one. So it's a continuation. Several comments opposed this recommendation believing that cities do not have a legal basis, we are not talking about capitol city names. We are talking about city names in general. So city names can be depending on the country. Of there were long discussions in the calls what is a city name? Which is not a capitol city name? A city name related with its population. It depends on the country. Countries very populated. Countries less populated. Small countries, big countries. So a city means different things in different countries in different environments so that was a long-standing discussion. So there are some opposition for this recommendation. There was also the case that there are many cities with the same name. All over the world. Some of them are unique, but some are not unique. You can find the name of the city in several countries. So that is also a problem. Who owns the right to have that letter of support? Only one may. So several comments opposed the recommendation believing that cities do not have a legal basis in the name and therefore no letter

---

of support non-objection should be needed. Several comments opposed the recommendation for a different reason. Believing the intended usage required they should be removed. New ideas. Substitute support or non-objection with informed consent. Do not require support when use associated with the city but applicant has trademark rights. Amend recommendations with some different, different language. This is was 11, and let's go to 13. -- 12 sorry. Can you change the slide please?

Hi Martin, you want to join us? From the audience or you want to come? This is my colleague Martin from GNSO. Much he has been fantastic help in all this process, and I made some changes to the slides yesterday. To make them easier to review. Welcome Martin. I know you're busy and appreciate that you're here. And I will -- we are reviewing the slides as we did yesterday. And we are getting to the last part which I think is the more funny one.

So a recommendation 12 remember we are talking about having letter of support for an application for any string that is an exact match of the subnational place name such as a country, province or state listed in the ISO 3166-2 standard. So several commenters they support from several. Several many. Several said they were opposed to this. But would be willing to support the recommendation. And several comments oppose the recommendation believing that governments as I said before do not have a legal basis in the name and therefore no letter of support or non-objection should be needed. Comments from colleagues? Questions? Let's go to the next one Gulden please. Julia.



New ideas. Text amendment I won't go into that detail now. If subnational place names listed in this list continue to be protected they should be subject to intended use requirements. This is what we talked before for other categories. Let's go to 13.

So a letter of support for a population for a string listed in the UNESCO region 4 or appearing on the combination of macro geographical constitutional regions. Subregions and selected economic and other groupings. In the case after application for a string appearing in either of the lists above documentation of support will be required from at least 60% of the respective national governments in the region. Say for example Latin America or South America. And there may be no more than one written statement of objection to the application from relevant governments in the region and or public authorities associated with the continent or the region. Where 60% rule is applied. And there are common regions on both lists the regional composition contained in the combination of the macro geographical... takes precedence. Let's go to the next one please.

Some several commented support this restriction. Several commenters are opposed but willing to support the recommendation still. Several comments oppose the recommendation believing that governments do not have a legal basis. Something that we talked before. That will be the name of a region or continent. New ideas? Some changes to the text, and amendment of the text. I won't go into that detail and let's go to the next one. So these are some open issues. Let's go towards them. Some of the comments. The issue of

translations. It's has been raised by several commenters. If I'm not mistaken in the Applicant Guide Book 2012 there was a translation considered for any language? Am I correct? For those lists. So long form name listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard. Short form name listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard and separable component of a country name designated and the separable country name list. Capitol city names. For these categories there was this restriction of translation into any language. [Inaudible] can you comment?

MARTIN WOOEISMT:

In terms of any language here it was quite interesting during our discussion yesterday in Work Track 5 that there was there's no recollection as to where the original guide book reference to all languages materialized from per se, and in practical terms that could be an issue because there are over 7000 languages around the world, and to be able to understand each and every translation for the terms listed here, so long form name after country, short name. Separable components. Capitol city names, that's quite an extensive list and multiply that out by 7,000 languages is considerable. And maybe very problematic to police as well. So some of the information here regarding the open issues and the comments that we've reviewed thus far in the Work Track have different opinions about how to make that perhaps more proportionate to reduce that down to perhaps a selection of languages, and I think here we've got listed here trying to reduce that down to something like perhaps U.N. official languages plus the native language of the country in question or the place or location, so that's been an interesting one. The originally, we've not had a

preliminary recommendation put forward in the initial report, so as an open issue it's been interesting to take some information from discussions yesterday, and furthermore discussions within Work Track 5 and comments that we received during this meeting.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Yes, and there were comments about the relevance of the 6 U.N. languages for some countries which were none of these languages is spoken. But at the same time there were interesting comments that international organizations like United Nations do work in those languages and documents are written in these languages so they have some relevance from the formal or government at point of view, and so it's not easy, and that's an open issue. More details in this light, I think we covered -- thank you Martin for your comments. Let's go to the next one. Thank you. Divergent issues and what is PC? I'm jet lagged. Divergent issues in PCD public comment thank you. 12 hours of jet lag is killing my memory. While it was determined to be out of scope since there are not geographic names many noted concerns with Work Track 2 proposal to lift restrictions on 2-character letter numbers and number letter combinations. I think we talked about this a minute ago. There are some concerns of confusion for example mixing letters and numbers that could be similar to like 0 and zero and L and 1 and so that could be -- that could be problematic. I don't know if you want to add something to that.

MARTIN WOOEISMT:

I think the reason it references Work Track 2 is because there is a

---

consideration around some of the application process which looks at string confusion. So this is an area that could actually be covered with aspects of string confusion tests and examinations rather than references it as a geographic term because it may coincide that it looks like PL or P1 for Poland for instance, so would that actually manifest itself as an issue through the string confusion test? Rather than stipulate a complete restriction.

OLGA CAVALLI:

So some of the comments related to alpha three-letter codes listed in ISO 3166-1 standard should be made available for regions. With some support in general available to any applicant or with approval about the government or public authority. Items in 2012 always required support knob objection. There are those that wish today extend the intended use provision. We have reviewed that before. Non-capital city names. There are those that wished to require support knob objection in all cases. As I said before that was long discussed what is the city. It's small city. Big city? How many people live in the city? It depends on the country. Region. Many questions. The basis for preventive protections. As I said. The preventive would be something that is required before the application. That's a letter of support or some support from the community, while a number of comments from willing to still support the 2002 implementations others were not. Some others thought preventive protections were not needed and just the they involved government or authority would have to file an objection, or do something after the string has been required, not preventing its request. Let's go to the next one please? Oh that was the last one. I

---

think I missed something -- there was the issue of the three-letter codes. That was in the last one and I miss it. Of can we go to one before please? Thank you so much. Next one please? Because there were several interesting examples yesterday. Yes.

MARTIN WOOEISMT: I can't repeat.

OLGA CAVALLI: No, but which one is it? The second point. Several comments with alpha three-letter codes listed in the ISO 3166-1 should be made available. This is the three-letter codes so there are some three-letter codes that are related with countries, but some are not used right? So for the moment that would be a restriction in use in those three-letter codes not, not available and so some think that could be a good opportunity to allow them for registration, I can think of only one example. Which was GIN so if there is the Vodka and wine, why not GIN so that would be restricted and there were other examples that I don't remember now. But were interesting. .can like Canada and it's a can of soup. And there were others. So that's food for thought and discussion and comments. So that's. That's the general -- one second, I will wrap up and give the floor to you. Very high-level summary of the compilation of the comments received, as I said about general comments. And preliminary recommendations mainly focus on contend already existing in the Applicant Guide Book 2012. Wove not yet reviewed all the rest of the comments. That will be surely done or on-line in a conference call or perhaps in the meeting in Marrakesh. And

---

Kavouss the floor is yours.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, good morning to everyone. First of all. Thank you very much. You Martin Olga and others from CNSSO for the very hard work you've done through there very difficult work of Work Track 5 which was not easy. There were some -- plus 40 GAC delegates that shown interest, but not more than 5 were participated. Very few. Very few. So this is an alarming situation. Number 2, I would like to draw your attention, and after many years of work that I have done, we should be very careful about selection of the words. Some, which is English is uncountable number. Maybe one. Maybe 5. Maybe 10. Then we go to many, or several, you should be very careful what does it means? I also with some, so the most difficult part is after this how this will be interpreted in the next step. If Work Track 5 does not provide a clarity on that, I have a fear that at the level of the Board situation will not be improved and the desired -- whatever they interpret these words, some, many, and several. So we should be very careful in the next steps. Those who work on the Work Track 5 to have some clarity of these when we say many noted or several noted, and so and so forth what will be that one so that is very important issue. So the first part I would say not very difficult one. The easy one. But the remaining part is now the questions, and the comments, and those 39 suggestions and so on. That is the very difficulty part but remains, and I think that we would have something because -- for the -- even inside the GAC there was some divergence of views. Yesterday we heard of one person, one delegate. One country saying he doesn't care about graphic names. To have anything with the

government is free. Few others have that so we have now a problem and difficulties. So we have to be very careful inside. But before that this notes some very -- and several need to be very careful and use of some of these qualifiers in same that to some extent. To greater extent. As soon as possible. As much as possible. To the extent practicable. All of these things are not transferrable to any technical language in the use of the gTLD. So this is general point I want to make. I'm sorry in the middle of your presentation. But not to forget I want to raise this point. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you Kavouss. I think before giving the floor to Martin, I think he wants to comment. The perfect reason... for the good and I think what the staff did is a compilation with the very good will of trying to reflect the level of the -- or the amount of comments received for each of the, of the different proposals. I agree with you that that there is, there is, there is meaning in the words, and that as a weight in the outcome. So, but please take this as a general overview of the comments received, and, of course, there is space for improvement. I don't know Martin if you want to add, Martin.

MARTIN WOOEISMT:

Thank you. Kavouss, I think we've noted the remarks particularly from Work Track 5 session yesterday that some of this wording needs to be refined, and good point taken. It was a general review of the comments that we've analyzed so far within the Work Track 5, so we will certainly take that back. I do want to add on comments regarding participation.

---

I think it is noticeable that you know, even across different groups there's many that sign up to the groups, there are very few that actively participate. So there's a lot of passive participation within the working group. The working tracks. Of including Work Track 5. However what I would encourage you to also look at is the number of responses that we did get within the Work Track 5 initial report that was issued compared to others. That was really helpful to see a diverse set of commenters coming in, including individual government representations, as well as other parts of the community. And even in there we can see divergence within GNSO perhaps ccNSO participants that submit something directly. So I think that that's a helpful note to see that there are at least responses to the public comments. Active participants in the Work Track are always welcome, and encouraged. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Martin, and thank you Kavouss for your comments and participation. You Jorge and others were very active and very valuable in the group. Of any other questions or comments from colleagues? So remember, this is only one part of the comment's compilation. There will be the questions and -- what was the other questions? Questions and proposals, yeah please go-ahead Martin.

MARTIN WOOEISMT:

You reminded me because Kavouss did mention in terms of handling the rest of the work it is important to understand that we've given you a snapshot of progress within Work Track 5. There were a set of questions that we wanted feedback from the community to take into



account which we still have to review. What we have got is a corset of preliminary recommendations that we are trying to see if there are substantial comments that move those recommendations at all or change completely. So is there something that we've completely missed? Misunderstood? And we want to revisit that in terms of the preliminary recommendations? But also there was a set of about 38, what we termed as proposals. They were proposals from members of Work Track 5. They're not proposals of Work Track 5 as a whole. But we wanted to put them in to see if there was any further feedback that we could use from the community to influence any of the changes that we would then consider to preliminary recommendations or any new recommendations that we wanted to put forward in the future report, or final report. So that has still got to be pro processed. We still need to see what influence those comments have on the items that we've already presented to you, so far but please treat that as a, a picture of where we are at this moment. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Martin. More comments? So this is only one part of the compilation. There will be others in the future and you will be invited to listen to the report. Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

I just wanted to raise from my distinguished colleagues in GAC the question that I -- not question -- the response that are given yesterday in your group with respect to a comment made by somebody saying the following. If in the report it is mentioned that one comment received

from in favor, or against, it should be noted that this one comment may come from a community of tens of the people, and that should be counted. I have serious difficulty to take that into considerations because there is no first of all, any statistic about that community, whether it represent 5 or 10 or 100, moreover. If you have to do that, when one comment from a government you have to go to the same thing saying that this government represent X number of the people so we can't go and should not go that line and that path during the entire... period for everything we need going to say comments by comments but not quantifying the comments so it should be very -- we should be very careful not to take that actions otherwise there would be some, some difficulty. In that case then we come to the government. You have to multiply them by number for instance country have 600 billion dollar people. You have to have 600 billion comments against or in favor. We can't take that. Never any public comment goes to that side. We have to -- we have to go to the same line of action that as we have taken already for many others. We have done it for the IANA transition. We have done it with the CCWTD. Cc **WLD** auctions and many others but not for this particular one. Quantify the comments and so on that is very dangerous process. Please kindly take that again in the working group. And when you continue these actions thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

I see your point, Kavouss, and it's very well taken. As I consider you a very experienced participant of all this processes that you have just mentioned. Would you have a suggestion how to -- because there is, there is some sense in saying much, some, several, would you have a

---

suggested way of approaching this weight of many or some or -- I don't know if I'm being clear? Do you have a suggestion how to address this text perhaps? Based on your experience that you mentioned?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you. I can't suggest anything because it's have he very complex. Very complex to say how you interpret many or several and so on so forth. We have several outside ICANN. Same questions. Try to avoid that. Find some other way around but not go that path. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Yes, go ahead.

MARTIN WOOEISMT:

I think these are always interesting conversations because it is it's not a straightforward black and white process when covering this point off, but what we have I suppose got to do is Work Track 5 collectively is to consider the fact that what is the substance of the comment? Should that substance of the comment be something that we've not explored previously within the Work Track which has been in deliberation for over a year? And so there's been a lot of conversations already within that Work Track that says we may have already covered similar points before but is -- particularly if there is substantive new comment or new ideas is something that will influence us as a work track group to explore that further.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you Martin. Very good suggestion. More comments? Yes go

---

ahead. Can you remember your name and you?

SRI LANKA: What is the time-line to finalize the report and the second question is once we finalize the report -- document main issues such as .amazon.

OLGA CAVALLI: Do you have a time?

MARTIN WOOEISMT: We've still got a fair bit of work to do in terms of reviewing the rest of the public comments, and working that through. The work track. We've got to remember that a Work Track is not the working group. It is a subset of the working group. And that working group is targeting quarter 3 of this year to issue a final report so the Work Track 5 it started later in the process. But it was a distinct and focussed area to work on so we are aiming to converge with a final report at the same time so it's one final report for subsequent procedures will contain the efforts of Work Track 5 as well and the recommendations put forward. That, that said there's steps in between here which is the Work Track 5 deliberations and ultimate recommendations that they put forward have to go through the working group first and once it's gone through the working group that's when the final report will be developed and issued and that will go out for public comment. So again there's other stages here that there will be public comment facilitated as you would normally see within a policy development process.

---

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you and about your question related -- Jorge -- with documents well the idea of all this process is to have a future round that would not have an outcome of several objections or conflicts. .amazon is a conflict from the first round so it's separate issue. Which is somehow related from the point of view. This is why we started these processes not to have this again. But it has to be solved on a different environment, so what we are trying to do is rules, I hope we do better rules, and we have less conflicts, and all the parties are happy, so that we have certainty for the applicant. For the governments and for the communities as well. That's the intention. Not easy to get but that's what we are trying to do for the next round. Jorge, please.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you. And hello everybody. Jorge Cancio for the record. Switzerland. This was more a procedural question because I see on the agenda that we had working group meeting and then plenary meeting or has this changed? So are we continuing now until 12:15 in this setting or are we reassembling as plenary?

OLGA CAVALLI: I have finished the material that I want to share with you, and I'm here if you want me to follow with any comments or ideas that you have? So I don't no he. Ghislain, do you have any idea how to deal with the time? No. So that I didn't know if it was going to take one hour and a half, one hour or -- it depended on the comments received. Do you have any suggestion for the rest of the 38 or 40 minutes?

---

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Olga. Well, I was assuming that we would structure a GAC discussion on the plenary part of this meeting because at least in -- in the color code agenda we had it separated in 5-1 and 5-2 so and that was my assumption, but of course I off-the-cuff. It's a bit difficult to make a proposal.

OLGA CAVALLI: Kavouss, you want to comment.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Not on this issue. On the issue that raised by distinguished colleagues about the issues or TLDs in tight lines. There was a meeting 2 days. 3 days ago, and Jeff Neumann mentioned that the new round or subsequent round or new gTLD does not address the pending issues. Pending issues should be addressed differently. So they do not talk about pending issues. So we should separate the pending issues from this procedure of Work Track 5 and others. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Sorry, we don't have that information, but we can find that for you Kavouss if you want. I don't recall that now. I had the comment from Jorge about discussing this as a plenary in the GAC so I'm -- I'm here for you. My idea was that it was a working group meeting, and my content is already reviewed with you, and thanks Martin for joining. And very much appreciated. And if you want to comment or have additional ideas about this remaining long half an hour, I'm here for you.

---

Comments? Questions? Yes forgot your name. I remember you from -- I don't recall your name, sorry.

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES:

Yes. Good morning, I'm from United Arab Emirates. So my question is regarding translation of geographic names into other language in particular the translation of city names. I recall you've mentioned that it's still open issue, but my question is whether this would cover also translation of names in for example English or other language, and as well as international domain names so for example a city name. Of it's in its own language, and its in its own script, because the translation means for example the name of the city in other language like for example maybe Dubai is written in English in certain way, and in other language its written maybe in a different letter. That's maybe translation or the way it's spoken, and then transliteration is how it's spelled in, in the way it's spoken in native language but in English, and then in IDN's what happens to it? I know its complex issue, but I haven't seen anything in the presentation or I haven't seen actually the report, so I don't know if there is anything about that. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

You make a very relevant question. Of I would say that having among the 6 U.N. languages some that used different letters like Arabic or CIRILIC or Chinese that the idea in the case that the translation is contemplated into the 6 U.N. languages of all the languages, IDNs should be included in the options. But the transliteration I don't recall that has been raised. But it could be a good point to consider when if

---

there is another round of comments or maybe we should review in detail all the comments that were made. I don't have that in mind now. I don't know, Jorge, if you have seen that? I haven't seen that. I think that IDN should be considered because they have several languages that do need the IDNs to be showed as they should be. I don't know if I answer your question. There were other hands up that I don't see now. Okay as I said before, we still have a way to go with the compilation of the comments. There is -- I will share with you the on-line document with this color code that I told you about. I found it quite useful because it's a huge amount of information, but the color code helps to have an at a glance a sense of maybe, avoiding this numbering or using some words like many, some, several, the visual code of the color helps in avoiding that. And then you have a sense of agreement or disagreement or concerns or new ideas. These are the 4 categories that the staff has used and I find it very useful so I will share with you and the GAC list the link to the public -- the compilation. It's an on-line document. Quite large. But, and it will be growing in size as the revision of the rest of the comments will be included in it, so you may keep on reviewing it as it grows. Any other comments? Ghislain, any other comments? No? Okay maybe we should close the session now? If there are no comments from colleagues, and I will keep you informed about new outcomes of the compilation of the comments. There should be or there will be for sure calls of the Work Track 5. You're welcome to join. If you are new to the group don't hesitate to send me an e-mail if you need some help, I can -- we can have a chat Skype or a conversation and maybe I can brief you how are we going through the process? I know it's difficult, I know it's a long group of documents. Very complex, but I



---

think there is value in the exercise, remember that this exercise started one of the points of start was our working group within the GAC because of the concerns that we have from the first round. Which conflicts still remain as you know. So use the space that ICANN created of there is also value that is cross-community. So we have a common work and understanding before the rules are already established. So let's -- if you are interested I will share with you, and there will be webinars and calls to review the documents and the compilation of the comments as they go. And thank you for your attention. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]