
HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Good afternoon, good evening. Humberto Carrasco. I would like to confirm with you that we can start with this call. We are on time and we have six people on both channels in English and in Spanish, so I would like to confirm with you that we can start the call. Thank you.

MARIO ALEMAN: Humberto, are you on the call?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Yes, we can start. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. We're going to start with the call. Please proceed.

MARITZA AGUERO: I would like to confirm whether Eleonora's colleague is connected on the call.

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes, we have both of them, Alex and Eleonora on both channels.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Mario, can you hear me?

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes, I can hear you very well so I'm just waiting for your confirmation to start with the call.

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.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Okay, let's begin with the call. Go ahead, please.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you very much, Humberto.

Hello, my name is Mario. I would like to welcome you all to this call. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to this LACRALO monthly call on Monday, July the 17th, 2017 at 23:00 UTC.

On the Spanish channel, we have the following participants: Maritza Agüero, Humberto Carrasco, Carlos Leal, Aida Noblia, Ricardo Holmquist, Eleonora Rabinovich, Alberto Soto, and Lito Ibarra.

On the English channel, we have Alexandria Walden and Vanda Scartezini.

We have no participants on the Portuguese channel and we have some apologies sent by Jacqueline Morris and León Felipe Sánchez.

On the staff, we have Silvia Vivanco, Rodrigo Saucedo, Steve Chan, and myself, Mario Aleman. And I will be managing this call.

Our interpreters today are on the English channel, Marina and Veronica, and the Portuguese channel, we have Bettina and Esperanza.

So with this, I would like to remind you all to state your names before speaking and to speak loud and clear, not only for the transcription, but also for the interpreters. So with this, we begin the call, and Humberto, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Mario. Maritza, could you please proceed with the agenda so that we can adopt this agenda?

MARITZA AGUERO: Thank you very much, Humberto. I would like to check if you can hear me okay.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, we can hear you, Maritza.

MARIO ALEMAN: We can hear you well, so go ahead, please.

MARITZA AGUERO: Okay, so we will begin with this call. Today we will have the participation of Eleonora Rabinovich. She is a Google manager for the government relations and public policies. She will speak about the hate speech and initiative for the European law.

And then we will have the participation of Harold Arcos. He is an ALAC member. He will be talking about some public consultations, and after that, we will have some other business. In this case, our President, Humberto Carrasco, will provide us with some news and updates.

And then we will finish this call with a webinar on country and territory names as TLDs by Steve Chan. He is a GNSO specialist at ICANN. And then we will have the evaluation survey.

So Humberto, go ahead, please. You have the floor.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much. Can you hear me okay?

MARTIZA AGUERO: Yes, go ahead, please. We can hear you okay.

HUMBERT CARRASCO: So we adopt the agenda. I would like to give the floor to Eleonora so that she can proceed with her presentation. So Eleonora, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

ELEONORA RABINOVICH: Thank you very much. First of all, I would like to thank you all for the opportunity to participate in this call. This is a very important topic. I will provide you with a very brief introduction on Google's view regarding the hate speech and controversial content, and I will speak about our policies and internal action lines and initiatives we are trying to address these issue, which is a complex one, and then I will give the floor to my colleague, Alexandria Walden.

Alexandria also works for the team and she is also responsible for, or is in charge of, dealing with issues related to freedom of speech and she

also works for the Public Policy and the Government Relations department for different countries.

So first of all, I would like to thank you all. I would like to give you an overview of this topic.

There are two topics that I would like to mention as introductory remarks. On one hand, we know that Internet allowed every person in the world to communicate to other people and to other communities around the world, and to share content being created. So Internet has allowed us to have a passive attitude, but also users are authors and creators of content.

And of course, this provides ideas and content and the circulation of ideas and content, and we also need some principles to deal with these communities and with these ideas, and to approach other communities with different ideas. But we're also users and we can use the benefits of Internet and many people believe that these are good things.

So we have many challenges in relation to this issue of hate speech. Internet is a global tool and we have different communities, global communities, so the different context of what we believe, which is an inclusive context, which has the definition of [hatred] or hate speech may change or vary according to the different communities and the geographical locations.

I mean, not all states, not all countries, not all the regulatory frameworks have the same rules because societies have different comprehension and tolerance frameworks, and they are all legitimate because they have to do with their cultural background and their

historical background. But when we refer to Internet, we have this challenge before us.

So the great challenge that is also interesting to mention as it is from this point of view is that Internet is an important channel, a communication channel and for the freedom of speech, and we also have to take into account respect for the personal opinions, so there are certain opinions which are in the limit of what we believe it is correct or not.

And this, of course, is closely related to freedom of speech because these are opinions that sometimes are adopted by a minority, which disagrees with the majority. So we have popular opinions and we have, also, opinions that might be considered illegal or not legitimate and we need to take this into account.

For example, many years ago, Galileo, for example, was considered to be crazy for his ideas and he was arrested for providing his ideas and for his research. What I mean is that there are many groups that have different positions, different points of view, and when we look that in retrospective, we have to think about this.

So I believe that this is a great challenge. Internet as a global community has a great deal of considerations to be taking into account, and on the other hand, we have that need to create a balance because we have to take into account the right of all the minorities to provide their input and their opinions even though these opinions are controversial ones.

With that introduction, and I would like to say that we are committed to providing a safe and responsible space in relation to Internet, and we

know that beyond all these ideas and considerations, we have some ideas in terms of Internet to promote the hate speech, and of course, we have the terrorist content as well now going around especially during the last years. We believe that we, as technologic, [etymologic] companies, we have to take this into account. We have to address the issue and we have to be serious in this respect, and to work together with other stakeholders, with the government, with other companies so as to be able to provide solutions to address these challenges, that is to say to give freedom of speech despite all this and also to be able to keep the diversity of opinions.

Let me tell you about the different things we are working on in our platforms and in our products that, of course, as you know, connect millions of users around the world. They can share information. They can create information, but we have policies and procedures for different situations.

First of all, we have mechanisms to remove illegal content on a local level. So we know that countries at local levels do have laws impacting the user of content and these laws change from country to country.

For example, in some European countries, the distribution of certain books is prohibited or forbidden. And in some other countries in Latin America, this is part of the freedom speech and the academic freedom, so clearly, local legislations are changing and we have a procedure to remove content for specific jurisdictions based on the legal legislation, that is to say to remove specific content and this is, of course, applied to local or based on local legislations.

So we have some procedures to address this and we also have Google products policies which are, perhaps, broader than the local regulations. But this is also applied at a local level. So these are some of the steps that we provide to treat content when this content goes against the law or the local legislation in certain countries and where we know that content will be restricted in a particular country.

We have these procedures to review these mechanisms, to review the procedure, and to review all the requests by the government to our system where we all get all the government requests and we take care of these requests because we have a very important policy for transparency to deal with these topics around the world.

Secondly, the second tool is the content policies. We have our products and we have policies applied to those products depending on the type of platform and service we provide because not all platforms are the same.

For example, in Ecuador, we provide or we have a platform and we measure that platform based on a web index. So we have a very wide policy for online content because that is surveys allowing to find content and is an index reflecting the situation at a specific moment.

Can you hear me? Hello? I don't know if you can hear me.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Yes, go ahead, please.

ELEONORA RABINOVICH: So we have some specific policies to remove content going against certain legislations or certain regulations. For example, pornography [type], and of course, well this is related to some other topic.

And then we have some other platforms, the hosting platforms, and this platform is also used by a community of users who are connected, locked into the platform, and we have more robust behavior rules.

We are quite committed to the freedom of speech, but we also very precise, accurate guidelines stating what is allowed and what it is not allowed. For example, we do not allow pornography. Pornography is illegal in many countries. There are some other channels where you can find pornography, but not in our products, and content inciting violence, this is not allowed as part of our rules.

And we have some different procedures, procedures alerting us about content violating our regulations and we also have some systems to alert us for content infringing or violating local laws. For example, in YouTube, content promoting violence against individuals are banned. Discrimination against nationality, gender, sex, gender identity, everything going against that is forbidden.

As you can see, this is a definition that is based on the international definition of the protection for human rights and also on the International Human Rights Convention.

So how do we collect requests or how do we collect complaints, for example, or reports if there is a user reporting something? We have a system and a team working 24/7 in all languages, and we receive reports based all in relation to different content. All the people in the

team were trained and they have to sometimes evaluate content based on the context. This is not easy, but that is something that we do.

And we also work together with the company and the civil society to improve our task because we believe collaboration is important.

We also have a program and we generate, or we create an organization network or a network for different agencies and individuals working on specific topics. They work with specific topics of controversial content, and with their help, we can review the content and provide reports or complaints.

We do not monitor. We do not do preventive monitoring. In fact, we have a system and the system is working very well.

Then we have some other policies, some new policies to promote both the content on the network. We have a non-publicity content, that is to say not to advertise, for example, content related to terrorists and we also have the AdWords tools, but we try to avoid this type of content.

And we also have rules so as not to promote terrorist content or terrorism-related content. This, of course, complies with the rules accepted by the community.

There are other things that I would like to share with you and it has to do with collaboration. We are quite motivated, or very motivated, to generate this and we believe that technology can have a positive use. We, as a community, as technology representatives, we need to promote the creation of content, of positive content.

So this is just an example. There are many content in the Internet which is offensive, for example, against certain communities such as the gay community, and we have a campaign that – I can send you information if you will. So we have this campaign and we have people working in the community. And they tell other people in the community how things get better. So the idea is to send a positive message about how discrimination can be reduced and how we can improve and be better people.

So this is a campaign that I would like to share with you later on because it reflects the positive use of technology.

We are also motivated and committed to, on the one hand, providing training and funds and creating networks and we also work with people committed to the same goal. We have different programs. There is a program called Creators. We are creating campaigns and last year, we had a meeting with 150 NGOs and activists to launch this initiative, and we have different initiatives and different approaches related to different issues which are very important for the Latin American region.

I know we are running out of time, so I would like to give the floor to my colleague, Alex, and she will tell you a little bit about some of the things we have been working on, the different issues that are happening in Europe.

ALEXANDRIA WALDEN:

Thank you, and thank you for the opportunity to address this group. Eleonora has covered all of the important information about the way

Google thinks about these issues and about how we approach them from a policy standpoint.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you very much, Eleonora, for your presentation. If I may, I'd like to suggest to our speakers.

ELEONORA RABINOVICH: I apologize.

MARIO ALEMAN: We do understand, but please try to speak slowly for the sake of the interpreters. We have a couple of questions.

ELEONORA RABINOVICH: Perhaps we can give the floor first to Alex so we can answer the questions together.

MARIO ALEMAN: Okay. Go ahead then. Go ahead, Alex.

ALEXANDRIA WALDEN: Okay, great. Sorry, I wasn't sure if folks could hear me.

Thank you again for giving me an opportunity to speak to this group. Eleonora has covered all of the important information. Can you hear me?

Okay, just wanted to make sure.

Eleonora has covered all of the important information.

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes, Alex, we can hear you very well.

ALEXANDRIA WALDEN: Okay, thank you.

And I just wanted to provide a few examples of some of the kind of current pressures that we are seeing from around the world and figuring out important ways, and constructive ways, to respond.

The first example I want to highlight is the work that we've been doing with the EU Internet Forum. This work comes out of our work with the EU Hate Speech Code of Conduct. That was a document signed by Google, Facebook, Twitter, and Microsoft, and the companies signed up to a voluntary agreement to review illegal hate speech and remove the hate speech that was illegal under a certain time period.

As a result of that voluntary agreement, we have sat many meetings thereafter with the EU government to report back on the information that we take down.

And although it originally came out of a lot of pressure, we have seen it as a positive step in the way that our companies have been engaged with the European Union.

That process has become more and more multi-stakeholder in the way that the companies and civil society and governments are able to work together to make sure that we are taking down the hate speech content that is illegal in a timely fashion.

One example of something that is the most recent and we think is very problematic as it relates to free expression is the new German Network Enforcement Law. This law was passed a few weeks ago, the last week of June, and it applies to any social network with more than 2 million registered users. And what it requires is it provides an obligation for those companies to remove “obviously illegal content” within 24 hours and then within seven days “non-obviously illegal content”.

And the difficulty with a law like that is that it provides incentive for companies to remove content only based on speed and not based on accuracy, and the problem we see there is that the impact on free expression can be detrimental.

As Eleonora pointed out, we are focused on context and we want to make sure that the content we’re taking down is content that violates either the law or our community guidelines.

And then the last piece I wanted to point out is about some of the pressures we’ve faced from the UK government. We’ve recently seen plans from, you may have noticed the [May] and President Macron plan that came out, and there has been a lot of conversation about how companies address terrorist content online, terrorist use of the Internet, and pressure on companies to do more and more in terms of what content we remove.

You may have also noticed that there have been statements that have come out of the G7 and the 5Is, as well as most recently, the G20.

In response to all of these concerns that we've heard, not just from the UK, but a variety of governments around the world from every region, the companies Google/YouTube, Facebook, Twitter, and Microsoft, we created something called the Global Internet Forum to Counter Terrorism. That's really seen as a place where we can formalize the ways in which companies work together to fight terrorism online, and we can create best practices and do knowledge sharing both with governments and with civil society.

As Eleonora said, we are committed to multi-stakeholder work and think that collaboration will be key to addressing not just terrorism online, but the hate speech issues that we see as well.

I'll stop there because I know we're over time and I'll be happy to participate in questions.

MARTIZA AGUERO:

Thank you, Alex, for your presentation and thank you, Eleonora, as well. I am going now to read the questions on the chat by Mr. Holmquist, which are, it says, "Eleonora, who defines hate speech? Who defines what is incitement to hatred? And is there any chance for defense after the allegation?"

ELEONORA RABINOVICH:

Martiza, I'm sorry, but I couldn't hear the question you've made. I cannot hear your question.

MARTIZA AGUERO: Have you heard the questions or should I repeat them?

ELEONORA RABINOVICH: No, I could not hear.

MARITZA AGUERO: Can you hear me now, Eleonora?

ELEONORA RABINOVICH: Yes, much better.

MARITZA AGUERO: Great. The questions are, who defines what is hate speech? Who defines what is incitement to hatred? Is there any chance for defense after the allegation, and also, who defines what is [segregism]?

ELEONORA RABINOVICH: Okay, let's see. Who defines what is hate speech? Okay, on the one hand, we have policies that are based on local regulations. So in those cases, when the local regulation does not allow a certain type of content and we enable or we remove a content based on regulation, it is the government who decides.

On the other hand, there are community policies and community rules where the definition of what is hate speech is based on the

[configuration] of the community rules, that is to say which content that incites to terrorism and violence.

Certainly, these are decisions of significant difficult to make, and certainly, it has to do with the context. And as companies, we are learning on a daily basis how to make those decisions when we are dealing with a community.

I don't know if Alex wants to add anything based on her experience to this question.

ALEXANDRIA WALDEN: No, I think Eleonora covered it.

MARITZA AGUERO: So, I have another question for you and Eleonora and for Alex. A question from Dev Anand. Where can we find additional information about these regulations? And along the same lines, a question of my own: where can we find the transparency report you mentioned by Google and the other?

ELEONORA RABINOVICH: Well, I can send the link to this report. All Google policies are online on our website, and this report is also online. Maritza, if you want, I can send it to your e-mail address so that you can disseminate it afterwards.

MARITZA AGUERO: Yes, thank you, Eleonora. We will circulate the document when we receive it. There is a question by Humberto Carrasco who is our Chair, who's asking, "How do we work with domain names?"

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: If I may, I want to expand the question. I want to know if there is any policy in the case of any registered domain name that incites hatred.

ELEONORA RABINOVICH: We are not responsible for the registration of domain names. I don't know, Alex, if you – well, it is not a product of Google, it is not a policy of Google.

MARITZA AGUERO: Thank you, Eleonora and Alex very much for your participation. Your talk has been very interesting, and if there are no further questions from our group, thank you again. And we hope to see you again.

ELEONORA RABINOVICH: No, thanks to you. Thank you so much.

MARITZA AGUERO: Go ahead, Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you, Alex and Eleonora, for the presentation. I want to know if there is Harold so that we can give the floor to him.

MARITZA AGUERO: Yes, Humberto. Harold is connected, so go ahead. Mario, Silvia, can we speak check Harold's audio?

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes, Maritza. That is presently what we were doing, and he's connected. It's just that we have to unmute him, and we are going to do just that right now.

HAROLD ARCOS: Can you hear me now?

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes, very well. Go ahead.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you. Well, we were asked to share with you recent actions in relation to some statements. The most important one in my opinion that was recently closed was the framework of interpretation on human rights, an extremely important statement. From our community, we've shown our interest on how ICANN is going to interpret human rights. To summarize, the ALAC considered that it was significant that any discussion on human rights is defined within the remits of the technical competencies of ICANN, and this is so because it is under the ICANN mission and vision, which is the domain names, IP protocols, number protocols, parameters, etc.

All this has been stated by the SSAC. Some aspects of importance here, for instance these evaluations are based on accessible content, and this is very much related to the topic that Eleonora has just talked to us about, because the evaluation of the content that goes through these unique identifiers should not be issue of discussion in relation to human rights in ICANN as organization. It is clear.

This means that any text that any language that seeks to link ICANN with direct recognition of a human right should be related to specific action, but within the scope of the technical competencies of ICANN, not the content itself. The content goes through other parts of the contracted parties.

So, if there is any locally enforceable law to be applied, the central value is a guiding principle as it has been stated, and not an unavoidable commitment. So, that is a case of enforcing the liability or respecting human rights. This framework of interpretation is extremely interesting, because as we all know, ICANN is a global organization, and that is precisely the technical support as the representative of the Google company has stated, this is the technical support of this whole infrastructure.

So, this has been recently closed, but it's not restricted. It is subject to review and new ideas, new inputs. But this is a very important work carried out by the Human Rights Group. In addition, we have the WHOIS conflict, the revised procedures on the WHOIS conflict. At present, there are laws such as that from the European community that are having an impact. More specifically, from the comments, there was information on the revised procedure for the management of WHOIS conflicts based

on the privacy law that was recently revised. Let me explain, for example, that this was based on a request by the GNSO. There was a public comment period related to the visibility of this additional trigger, and how this has been working was this was an element to manage WHOIS conflict – sorry, but there is noise.

MARIO ALEMAN: Go ahead, Harold. You're still connected.

HAROLD ARCOS: So, this trigger that I was talking about is a process which is activated whenever a registry operator detects that there is a request for an action that will be in conflict with a local law, a privacy law. So in that case, the new trigger, the element that triggers this procedure – well, there is an indication that this alternative trigger will be updated with the additional feature that it will deliver to ICANN a document with the statement of the local office, which is the government office, the government of the place where this action is being generated, declaring that this request is in conflict with a local privacy law.

So, what we are adding is this alternative trigger according to this new, revised WHOIS procedure. We are adding this statement of the government office among many of the things that we're going to see on our confluence wiki page.

Another important area to discuss is the draft framework to explain or to assist the registry operators how to manage security threats. This was the work of the multi-agency team that offered this framework to

registry operators, and to explain how the registries can facilitate the action for instance of law enforcement agencies.

While this was discussed by the various GAC groups, they made no comments about it, so now it's been addressed by the At-Large community for our analysis. So, if we can give our input on this to the registry operator.

Another very important area of work is that the ICANN Board requested the approval to the Empowered Community to amend one of the fundamental Bylaws of ICANN – and this is very important. It could be rather simple for some. Some might think that this is simple, because this change, this amendment would eventually lead to the creation of a new committee responsible for the accountability of the Board. Actually, it is committee for transparency mechanism, with also ICANN accountability mechanisms. But this is the first exercise, the first time that the Board requests the Empowered Community [inaudible] an approval of this kind. That is why Sébastien Bachollet warned us about the importance of this. Even though the working groups on the second track on transparency are not over yet with their work, we should not stop. And he also said that we should consider this subject very important, because it is the first time that the Empowered Community is involved, even though it's just an action of an operational nature, which is the creation of a community. But the Board has said in its request that these aspects of transparency mechanisms is very important, and there should be a committee to work on this, because the workload is significant.

So, for this to be operational, three of the five community groups or constituencies will have to grant approval. Not more than one constituency should reject it. So, from ALAC we are reporting that we recommend the change.

On my side, this is all. There are many more areas to discuss and analyze, but that's to be discussed by LACRALO. But in my opinion, this is the summary of what we have been recently discussing. Thank you, Humberto, and thank you, Maritza. I understand we do not have much more time.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Can you hear me?

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes, go ahead, please.

MARITZA AGUERO: Yes, go ahead, please. Thank you very much, Harold, for the presentation.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Maritza, Humberto, would you like to proceed? Humberto, go ahead, please.

MARITZA AGUERO: Thank you very much, Silvia. We will continue with our agenda for today, and before going to the webinar by Steve Chan, the GNSO specialist at ICANN, I will give the floor to Humberto Carrasco. He will speak about some issues of interest for the community. So, Humberto, go ahead, please. You have the floor. Mario, Silvia, can we check Humberto's audio, please?

MARIO ALEMAN: Maritza, please, I would like to remind you all to unmute your line, you have to press *7.

MARITZA AGUERO: Okay. So, in the meantime, can we please put on the screen the presentation?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Hello.

MARITZA AGUERO: Humberto, go ahead, please.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Can you hear me okay now? Just checking my audio, can you hear me?

MARIO ALEMAN: Humberto, go ahead, please. We can hear you loud and clear.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I am not at the AC room right now, but you are supposed to be now seeing Gantt chart. The idea of this chat is to show you the advancement of the commitments for the consultation period. You can see that there are some names and some dates where you see the commitments and the date for the mediation process.

Of course, this is a Gantt chart which is very dynamic. You can see there the person in charge in the second column. You see HCB, Humberto Carrasco Blanc, or Maritza Aguero, or GWG, which is the Governance Working Group, or the Elders Working Group. There is some other option to create a new working group, which is a PDP working group.

Staff is on the right, so if you pay attention to this, you will see that the Governance Working Group and the Elders Council Working Group are working on specific topics for the mediation process. So, we should review the priorities in order to meet all our commitments. This is in general lines, this is what we are doing to meet the goals and to comply with our mandate. So, thank you very much.

MARITZA AGUERO: Thank you very much, Humberto. Now, I would like to give the floor to Rodrigo Saucedo for him to provide a presentation for our next speaker. This is a topic that was included in the webinar cycle to meet the goals we have committed ourselves to, and this is capacity building for the community.

Rodrigo Saucedo, go ahead please.

RODRIGO SAUCEDO:

Good evening, everyone. Thank you very much. For those who do not know me, I am the strategic initiative manager for the Latin American and Caribbean region at ICANN. I am responsible for leading the regional strategy at ICANN. And one of the projects of this strategy that was approved by the worldwide community was the project for capacity building.

We have been working on this project with the different organizations within ICANN, and specifically with LACRALO. Maritza already mentioned that. We developed a training program with different webinars that are related to PDPs or to topics that are being addressed inside the ICANN community. So, this is the third webinar that we have in 2017. In this opportunity, we will be discussing the use of country- and territory names. This is not a PDP, this is a topic being discussed in different community working groups.

So, in this opportunity, we have Steve Chan, who is the GNSO specialist at ICANN, and he's very well aware of this topic, so I would like to thank him for his participation. Steve, go ahead, please. You have the floor. Thank you.

STEVE CHAN:

Thank you very much, Rodrigo. As mentioned, my name is Steven Chan. I'm Policy Director for the GNSO Support Team. I will give you a quick update on the Cross-Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names. You can see the acronym there, the CCWG-UCTN.

First, we'll start with the agenda. I'll provide a little bit of background on the project what this CCWG is concentrating on and working on. We'll talk about, third, what the current status of this CCWG is, fourth, what are the next steps, five, how to get involved, and then lastly, we'll have time for a little bit of Q&A.

So, background. This Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Country and Territory Names was established quite some time ago in 2014. It was jointly initiated by the GNSO and ccNSO, so both of those organizations are chartering organizations for this effort, though participation on the actual CCWG was not limited to just those community organizations, but there are also participants from the GAC and the ALAC, and perhaps others.

So, what is this CCWG about? The purpose of this CCWG as noted in the charter for this group is to determine whether a harmonized framework for the use of country- and territory names is feasible. And to the extent that that is possible, then the CCWG is to develop specifics and framework for that harmonized framework.

It's important to note that this CCWG is limited to country and territory names as listed on or as eligible in ISO 3166-1. So, specifically, this would be limited to two-letter, three-letter, and full names. So, the current status of the CCWG. The CCWG in its deliberations only ended up considering two- and three-letter country codes. For two-letter strings or codes, the CCWG was able to reach preliminary consensus in support of the status quo. In other words, leaving the two-letter strings exclusively reserved for ccTLDs, although some would note that this preliminary consensus was made with the consideration that there were

additional elements to be considered and negotiated, including the three-letter codes and the full names. However, when the working group got to three-letter codes on the ISO 3166-1 list, there were a wide range of views among many participants, some ranging from those who felt that the three-letter codes should be treated as ccTLDs and then others on the other far range who thought that they should be completely wide open and available to any, and then others in the middle who thought that the three-letter strings could be used perhaps with governmental support.

The CCWG was unable to reach consensus on this, and as a result of that, it determined that it was not able to continue to work and did not actually discuss full names at all. So, the conclusion for this CCWG of the members in the group determined that a harmonized framework is not feasible. This is actually for a variety of reasons. One is that there are multiple parallel work streams going on within the community. One of course is this CCWG, but there's also a GAC working group that is looking at geographic names. And then there's also the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP working group within the GNSO that has geographic names within its charter.

Another issue that the CCWG determined that a harmonized framework is not feasible is that the CCWG's mandate and scope is too limited. As I noted above, it's limited to two- and three-letter codes and full names at the top level, where some in the community might believe that work on geographic names more broadly is required.

And then finally, as there's no clear connection between the CCWG and policy development process either through the ccNSO or GNSO. In other

words, a CCWG as defined in the Bylaws is not one of the mechanisms that is able to develop policy for the ICANN community.

So, the CCWG-UCTN did not actually make substantive recommendations related to two-character, three-character or full country and territory names. As I noted on the previous slide, the CCWG actually concluded that they're unable to achieve and develop a harmonized framework. That was the substance of its first recommendation, which is essentially to close the CCWG because that harmonized framework is not feasible under the current circumstances.

The second recommendation was related to consolidating efforts. As I had noted on the previous slide, there is a number of different efforts that are discussing geographic names in different forms, as well as with a different scope and focus. And then finally as the CCWG's last recommendation was that whatever mechanism that is chosen to develop policy, it must be all inclusive and to allow all those interested in the topic to have a voice and be able to participate in the development of any policies related to country and territory names, and perhaps more broadly, geographic names.

Finally, if you'll notice from the recommendations on the screen, what the CCWG was unable to do was to determine what mechanism would be used to develop any future recommendations, and so essentially how to effectuate recommendation two here.

The CCWG released its interim report for public comment on the 24th of February. It received 15 comments related to the recommendations of the CCWG, which just as a reminder we're about closer of the CCWG,

and then future next steps about how to address this topic. And then of course, the recommendations were not about the two-letter, three-letter and fully country and territory names.

What the report also included though was the deliberations around those topics, and it also included an extensive history about the [inaudible]

RODRIGO SAUCEDO: Excuse me. Please, I would kindly ask all participants to mute your lines.

MARITZA AGUERO: Steve, please, go ahead, and sorry for this. Go ahead, please.

MARIO ALEMAN: I would like to know whether Steve Chang is on the call so that he can proceed with the presentation. Thank you. Steve, are you on the call? If that is the case, please, can you proceed with the presentation? Thank you. Maritza, can you please continue with the call? I'm not sure if Steve is connected.

MARITZA AGUERO: Rodrigo, can we please confirm whether Steve is on the call? And if not, can we reconnect him to the call? And if not, can we reconnect him to the call? And please, I would like to remind all participants to mute their lines so that we can listen to the presentation. Thank you.

RODRIGO SAUCEDO: Steve is on the call. Go ahead, please. And sorry for the interruption, but there was someone talking, there was background noise and we asked him to mute his or her line. Go ahead, please, Steve. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Steve, we're still not –

STEVE CHAN: Hello?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: If that's Steve, we can hear you now.

STEVE CHAN: Thank you. I'm not sure what happened. I was speaking earlier and it seemed to be working. Not sure what happened. Whoever just spoke, could you possibly tell me where you might have lost me from audio? Was it around talking about the interim report?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I'm on the English channel. Steve, you were talking about the – yes, the publishing of the interim report in February.

STEVE CHAN: Okay. Thank you very much. Apologies all for the interruption. I'm not sure exactly what happened, connectivity. As I noted, the interim report of the CCWG was published for public comment on the 24th of February.

15 comments were received, and they were around three general areas related to the recommendations of the CCWG, which as a reminder were not substantive recommendations around two-letter, three-letter and full country names, but rather about the closure of the CCWG.

There were also comments around the improvement of the text in the interim report, and then there were actually also comments and suggestions directly related to two-character, three-character and full names of countries and territories.

The CCWG integrated those projects and completed its final report in June of 2017. In that final report, it included all the comments from commenters as an annex related to the two-letter, three-letter and full names of country and territory names. That final report is currently sitting with the ccNSO and the GNSO as chartering organizations of the CCWG, and it will be up to those two organizations to determine the next steps for this working group and its report.

So, what are the next steps? Again, the ccNSO and GNSO Councils currently have this final report. They will be considering it and determining what the next steps are. It's not entirely clear what those next steps will be. As I said, it will be up to them to determine. One last note is that the feedback and input from the respective councils will be actually integrated into the final report once that input is received from both of those councils.

And finally, how to get involved. This is a bit of an interesting one, because as I noted, the CCWG is essentially closed at this point. So, participation in this particular working group is pretty much not possible

because it concluded the work. So, many of you might be aware there were discussions at ICANN 59 related to the topic of geographic names. So, while the group of this CCWG is essentially done, there is quite a bit more work for the community to do on the topic of country and territory names, or more broadly geographic names.

For those who participated in those geographic names cross-community working sessions at ICANN 59 will have seen that it's not clear to the community how these topics will be addressed. Some of the suggestions were work track five in the GNSO's new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP working group. Some within this CCWG had discussed chartering a new CCWG with a new expansive or a different charter that might allow it to be able to develop that harmonized framework.

So, the next steps for how this topic will be addressed are still being developed by the community. There is not clear guidance at this point. And I believe that is the last slide, so I think that's it.

If there are questions, please let me know. I would note that there is actually community leadership for this working group, so I'll do my best to answer all the questions, but I may defer to the community leadership in getting answers for some of your questions.

RODRIGO SAUCEDO:

Thank you very much, Steve. Your presentation has been very clear. I imagine that there are certainly some questions from the community, so we will now open the floor for questions, so those of you who have any question, you know you can raise your hand and make your

question on the Adobe, or you can also write the question in the chat. So, let's give a few moments to check if anyone has a question.

MARITZA AGUERO: There is a comment from Dev on the chat on the presentation. Well, yes, Steve's presentation will be posted and shared on the wiki with the entire community.

RODRIGO SAUCEDO: Thank you, Maritza. There is a comment from Vanda. "Very good summary, Steve." Okay, go ahead, the group. If there is any question, this is the time. If there isn't, we will close and end the call earlier. This is a very good comment from Steve on the chat for everyone's information, that the community leaders on this topic are Heather Forrest and Carlos Raul Gutierrez, whom most of you know from the GNSO. And Annebeth Lange from the ccNSO.

MARITZA AGUERO: Rodrigo, please, can we give more seconds before closing? Because there are people typing in the chat and there may be some questions for Steve before he closes.

RODRIGO SAUCEDO: Of course.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Yes, there are some comments on the chat. Maritza, could you please read them?

MARITZA AGUERO: Humberto, the comments have already been read by Rodrigo, and there are others being posted, but not related to Steve’s presentation. Dev has shared an advance on the outreach and engagement presentation, and then commented to the comments of Lance and Carlton by Dev himself. Let’s wait a few more minutes to check if there are any questions for Steve, and then we’ll close the webinar.

If there are no further questions or comments for Steve, we’re going to thank him. I’m going to circulate the presentation. Thank you, Steve, and we will take you into account for future occasions. So now, Mario, this is time for the survey.

RODRIGO SAUCEDO: I just wanted to thank Steve Chan for sharing his time with us on this webinar. Thank you very much. Your presentation has been very clear, and on behalf of everyone, we thank you for your participation.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you, Rodrigo, and thank you, Steve, as well for his excellent presentation. Now, I would like to share five questions on the evaluation of the webinar. The first question is the following: “How do you rank the webinar in terms of quality of information?” Very good, good, sufficient or fair, bad, very bad, and no vote?

Thank you for your answers, let's go to the second question. "How was the presenters' delivery?" Extremely strong, strong, sufficient, weak, extremely weak or no vote? Thank you for your replies.

Number three, "Do you plan on using this information with your ALS group?" Yes, no, no vote.

Number four, if yes, please explain how you could use this information with your group of ALSes. As this question requires some time to be filled in, you will have a few more seconds before going to the next. Very well, thank you for your replies.

Now the last question on the survey: "Do you have any other comment or recommendation for this webinar?"

Very well. thanks to all of you who have answered the survey. With this, we close the survey, and I will give the floor back to Maritza or Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I wanted to thank together with Maritza for your participation your attendance. The quality of the presentations has been very good, very interesting. The presentations and the Gantt chart will be shared to the mailing list very soon. So, thank you all. Good evening, and see you soon. And also, thanks to the interpreters. Thank you for your work.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you, Humberto. With this, as was said, the call has ended. Thank you all for joining this webinar. Good evening.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, everyone. Take care, all. Thanks again to the interpreters.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]