

Suzanne Sene: Thank you Heather, and Frank, and Christina for putting the question out because I think you used the word limitations, and I think Frank's initial answer is of course, the only correct one. The participation by an individual is never in the individual's personal capacity. If you're a GAC member you are representing your government at all times. And for us to participate as GAC, or for an individual to represent the GAC, I again concur with Frank, the only person who currently is sort of authorized by the GAC if you will to speak for the GAC is our GAC Chair and in particular in the function of liaison to the Board and that is typically after the GAC has reached consensus on a position and it's also typically in writing so it is very clear.

Now, obviously we rely on the good judgment of our Chair to fill in and answer questions that she might be posed, but she has been privy to all of the GAC discussions and so knows where the sensitivities are and why we wrote a sentence the way we wrote it if you will. So going down the road, if we looked at this most recent Cross Community Working Group as an example, I think a lot of us certainly understand that that was a very sincere and well intentioned effort to respond to a problem that was identified in a very short turnaround time. From my perspective, and all of us had access to all of the emails, I found it literally impossible to participate just due to the sheer number of the emails that were exchanged on a daily basis; the number of poll results, the number of conference calls and my need, my requirement to weigh in with cleared positions. So I found that to be a real constraint, that I was unable to make any contribution or to participate

because it was just moving too quickly, the debate frankly was a very interesting debate, but was going back and forth too quickly for me to make a contribution that would not have been, that would have necessarily needed to have been a cleared position. So Frank is also quite correct that the GAC is mindful that there may be other circumstances down the road where there is a requirement for this kind of a Working Groups' approach, I think the GAC will still face the same challenges.

So, if I could also throw out, it's in the context of the GACs efforts with the Board in the joint GAC/Board Working Group on the role of the GAC in ICANN, which is still continuing its efforts because we want to take into the account the Accountability and Transparency Review Team recommendations, goes to the issue of how the GAC interacts not only with the Board, but with the rest of the community. So that is a subject on our plates as to how do we get GAC contributions into a policy development process earlier in the process. So we've had some interesting exchanges with our Board counterparts who have, I think from our perspective, fairly predictably urged the GAC to simply participate at an earlier stage. And again, I think for many of us it's not the question of participation, it's then what happens to that contribution. So right now, as we all know, under the bylaws the GAC is structured to provide advice to the Board. So if the Board wishes our advice to be taken into account elsewhere in the ICANN community, presumably the Board has to say so or the Board has to invite you all to please take it into account.

So we're at an interesting stage in our deliberations between the GAC and the Board and we haven't resolved this issue. I just wanted to sort of throw that out to you that it's a real challenge from our side with the constraints we have. Having said that though, I think there's a great deal of interest in wanting to participate much earlier on and having the productive exchanges to help inform the process. So if we can kind of jointly begin to think of ways to facilitate that I think I'm certainly open to it, I don't want to speak for my colleagues, but my sense around the table is that everybody is open to that to make it constructive. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Thank you United States. Is anyone wanting to comment further? From the GNSO side? Follow up?

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Heather. Thank you very much Suzanne, I appreciate your words. And you said that you would be willing to find ways to facilitate that open and constructive way forward. Which would be the next step for that to happen? How do you foresee that?

Suzanne Sene: Well hopefully our exchange is like this and maybe we need to structure them around so we are brain storming because that is how I see this. We have a target of March to finalize our joint Working Group report and I'm looking at my Chair to sort of correct me and it may well be that we keep you apprised of the recommendations that we intend to put in that report. And perhaps seek your views as to some of them. They would be recommendations, they would not be, I mean we're not imposing solutions if you will, suggesting a number of steps that could be taken. I mean frankly there's

another one if I may expound a little bit, that really doesn't have anything to do with our interactions per se, but it has to do with facilitating those interactions. And by that I mean the GAC currently, right now, doesn't really interact with ICANN policy staff, if you will and on some occasions that would be very helpful for us to get a better understanding of how the policy staff is taking your work and developing implementation proposals.

So one example right now that we did just discuss recently before you came in the room, was the status of the Board's response to the Rec 6 Working Group. So the reason the GAC did not respond to the Rec 6 Working Group recommendations, was it was our judgment, that Frank came up with that most of us concurred with, that we didn't necessarily need to because it was going straight from the Rec 6 Working Group straight to the Board, that what we needed to be prepared to comment on is the Board's response to that and of course we don't have that. So it's there are some process points and timing issues where we need to maybe the tweak the current processes and timing and related staff support so that we're not continuously passing one and other like great ships in the night.

Olga Cavalli:                   Thank you Suzanne. Tim.

Tim Ruiz:                   Just a question Suzanne if you can. In regards to the Board's response to the rec six, in the recently posted proposed final application guidebook there was a memorandum of explanatory whatever in regards to the rec six recommendations where the

Board kind of laid out in a matrix each of the recommendations and then a response. So I'm just curious if you had seen that yet and if so why that's not considered a Board response or what it is that you're waiting for as far as a Board response is concerned.

Suzanne Sene: Apologies for that we may not be understanding the process correctly. It was our understanding that in fact ICANN staff are still working with the Rec 6 Working Group to resolve some outstanding questions. So it may be that we are adopting a rather formalistic view but that was our understanding.

Olga Cavalli: Jamie.

Jamie Hedlund: As I understand, the GAC has the understanding that this Cross-Constituency Working Group would, should refer directly to the Board and not to the ACs and SOs that constitute that Cross Community Working Groups. Did you understand my question? No? The Cross Community Working Groups should refer directly to the Board in your opinion or should refer to the community bodies that participate in them? I mean the recommendations should be go directly to the Board and then GAC would react to the Board as I understood you put it, but wouldn't it be, create another body to in this community I mean that has overcomes the supporting organizations and ACs.

Olga Cavalli: Suzanne, Margie? Margie, you want to go first? So sorry, New Zealand, yes.

Frank March:

Thank you. Let's be quite clear, there's been one Cross-Constituency Working Group that the GAC has taken part in and it hasn't taken part in it, members of the GAC contributed to its work. That timeline was extremely tight. Within that timeline it was not possible for the GAC to reach any sort of consensus position. In fact, it will take a meeting of this type for the GAC probably to reach such a consensus position and it might well take several meetings of this type. So it seemed to me, and it was only common sense, within the timeframe of that one Cross-Constituency Working Group that anybody has taken part in from the GAC that the only possible solution was to seek, to look at the response of the Board.

That's the first point I'll make. The way forward, and I emphasize this point that we do, I believe, and it's my belief it is not the belief of the GAC at this point, that we do have to come to terms with this method of working. And that there may well be a process whereby when time permits, when the process permits, that we would in fact comment on a report before it goes to the Board, but that is not part of the bylaws of this organization at this point and those may need to change if the GAC is going to input in that way. But the GAC has not discussed the point that you're asking. And all we've been faced with is one practical solution to one practical situation and that's all I'll say about that. There's another point, but that will do for the moment.

Olga Cavalli:

A comment, but we have Suzanne, Margie, and Edmon. Go ahead, briefly.

---

Jamie Hedlund: I understand your wording that this is an exceptional occurrence and I would ask, just asking if the bodies, both GNSO and the GAC would make the case for an exception to become the rule and that's something to be...

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Jamie. Suzanne, you want to add something to that? No? Margie?

Margie Milam: I just wanted to clarify a couple of things that Suzanne had asked about. The explanatory memorandum was not a Board paper it was a staff paper, so it hasn't gone up to the Board yet and I just wanted to clarify that if that was a misunderstanding.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Margie. Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Yeah, on the topic of that Jamie brought up I think it's kind of interesting and also when Suzanne talked about one of the things seems to be the time. Every time GNSOs or other groups work with GAC in any type of joint effort, probably time is of essence in a different type of way. So I wonder, you mentioned March as that some sort of report would come out, would kind of these types of or this method of working together between SO/ACs, would there be some indication of what type of timelines should be put in place if in the future that something like this happens?

In fact, I want to point back to, I think there are a couple of examples in the past that this would have sort of happened, in the

IDNC Working Group, the Fast Track Working Group in fact, the IDNC created report which was then passed through the GAC and the ccNSO and I believe the GAC was asked to respond to it before it then went on to the Board. That was the process for that particular joint effort and I know that currently the GNSO and the ccNSO when we work together on the jig, on the Joint IDN Group, that also happened. The whatever is produced goes back to the SO for consideration before it then goes to the Board. I think the rec six seems to be something different, but I think Jamie's question was going forward if we are going to produce these types of things perhaps is there a preferred way whereby it comes back for a passing before it goes to the Board.

Olga Cavalli: Suzanne, you want to respond?

Suzanne Sene: Thank you and thank you for that Edmon. I think you have, we have a couple of examples sort of on the GAC side in our experience, primarily with the ccNSO as you pointed out. And actually, for example the fast track, that was actually a joint activity, but it wasn't constrained by the three week turnaround. So the three week timeline I think probably is always going to be hugely challenging for any government representative because all of us have procedures in capital for coordination, consultation, ... It goes on and on and on. Some countries have less elaborate than others, but we all have them and they must be followed because we are not here to wing it, we can't give you our personal views, it has to be an official position.

What we structured was a completely open ended email list and we were able to review and comment on all of the changes as they were being made. And then there was that step of before anything went to the Board, there was the opportunity of the final review. So one of the suggestions that we have taken up in our joint Working Group with the Board is since the bylaws currently only provide for the GAC advice to go to the Board, are they giving any thought and is this a useful suggestion to consider whether some of the bylaws could be amended so that the SOs who are charged with developing policy have the, would be able, in a position to tell the Board when they advance a policy proposal that you have already consulted with the GAC, that you've went ahead and got GAC input before you finalized the proposals.

Now there may be all sorts of practical challenges in that approach, but that is certainly an idea that has come up because the only other solution, it strikes us, and these are very preliminary exchanges even around our own table so, would be for the Board to then as soon as it got something from the GAC it would have to send it down to the relevant body and say please tell us how you would take this into account; that's one option. Or alternatively, when it received a policy proposal, it would either ask the appropriate body or staff to analyze how and whether that proposal took GAC advice into account. Os in some way I think it behooves everybody to find the right way.

We did think, we noted, that there was a very gracious recommendation in the Rec 6 Working Group report that suggested

that all SOs and ACs should be consulted, but of course, because you were on such a tight timeline it had to go straight to the Board. So I think we understood that and agreed with Frank's judgment that we didn't need to comment at that point, we would just sit back and wait and see what was coming back the other direction. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Suzanne. Tim.

Tim Ruiz: It's really helpful to understand that clearly because in this case if the rec six, if that explanatory memo is actually just the staffs thoughts, although when you read through that it sounds as though it's hard to make some of those statements without having cleared them with the Board, but if that is the case then of course the next response from the Board is going to be thumbs up or thumbs down and a resolution and then it's a little late for GAC advice. So I think that it's really helpful to understand how it's working today because it gives us an idea of where we might need to go tomorrow in order to make these kinds of things work much better. So I appreciate that.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Tim. I have Jeff, yes Jeff, go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Hi, I'm Jeff Neuman with the Registry Stakeholder Group. Just a real quick comment, just for information we have not as a GNSO council endorsed the rec six either. So it's, we're considering it at this point. So I don't want to leave you all with the impression that

we've actually approved it yet either. So, I just thought that was important to get that on the record.

Olga Cavalli:

Thank you Jeff, that's a very relevant comment. Are there further questions or comments about this issue? I would suggest that we as I think Suzanne very wisely said, try to keep on finding ways to facilitate this moving forward. I think we all find value in the exchange of ideas around different SOs and ACs in the community. So thank you very much for the interaction and perhaps we should move forward to the next issue. Jamie, last comment.

Jamie Hedlund:

One last comment on this. The kind of time sensitive issues I think I still don't know if the cross community groups are an effective, it proved to be, seems to be in the case of rec six, it's amazing how far they went, but since there still have to pass through the formal bodies, I still don't know if it is a way to go in time sensitive matters. So, but I do believe that this joint effort should engage every SOs and ACs early in the process, but should not prevent the formal bodies to have a position and this applies both to the GAC and, in my opinion, to the GNSO.

Heather Dryden:

Thank you for that comment. If we can move on to the next item on the agenda, we have a question that we'd like to put to the GNSO regarding the DAG and I will ask Bill Dee from the EU Commission to ask that question.

William Dee: Thank you. It's very simple actually. I just wanted to know what the views of the GNSO members were on DAG 5. I know you're a fairly mixed constituency of stakeholders actually and I just thought it would be very useful for the GAC to hear what your views are on the latest draft final version. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Bill. Adrian.

Adrian Ketter: I know the views from, Adrian Ketter sorry, Registrar Stakeholder Group. I know the views from Registrar Stakeholder Group are that we understand there are, well we're happy with the overall direction I think, I think it's fair to say that there are some items that still need some tightening up. However, are buoyed by the direction largely that has been taken and positive with the majority of the changes that have come through. So I think that's fair to say from our stakeholder group, that we're enthusiastic about the progress however, still respectful that there are some items that could do with tidying up. And without going into debate about which ones unless that's potentially what you want to hear is which ones we believe, but that's probably a three hour topic so.

Olga Cavalli: Anyone else want to comment from GNSO? Christina, please go ahead.

Christina Rosette: Christina Rosette, I represent the Intellectual Property Constituency and I'm sure it will come as no surprise to know that while the trademark community generally welcomed some of the changes, notably the shortening of the URS answer period and

further detail as to what exactly ICANN means by substantive evaluation that the general view in our community is that the protections that are in place are far from sufficient. There's also a view that more work does in fact need to be done on malicious conduct as well. The economic study, which was just released on Friday, frankly still has not been read by most of the members of our community although I understand that it has some information that the trademark owner community in particular will be interested to see.

And finally, that the Board's 180 on vertical integration has raised additional issues that frankly require more development and kind of making those consistent throughout the guidebook.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Christina. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: I think from the Registry Stakeholder Group I would echo what Adrian said. I think we're excited about the prospects and I know what you heard from Christina from the IPC, I will say as a registry that has talked to a number of trademark owners that would like their dot brand tld, I think there is some divergence in that community as well and I think Adrian and some others in the room can attest to that. So I think as Adrian said, I think there are some small issues and that need to be tightened up, but I think overall the Registry Stakeholder Group is excited to actually move forward and get more competition in the space.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Jeff. Wendy?

Wendy Seltzer: Thank you. Wendy Seltzer from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. I think that while each of us and probably every individual could pick issue with specifics, overall I think in our group there's a strong sense of we have a reasonable package, we need to move things forward. And I think it would be appropriate to move this forward by giving it a shot with the applicant guidebook that we have.

Olga Cavalli: Other comments from GNSO members or from GAC members? United Kingdom?

Mark Carvel: Thanks very much, that's a very useful survey of views within the GNSO. I presume it is fairly comprehensive. Is there any group within the GNSO that hasn't reflected there, whose view is not reflected in what we've just heard; first question. Secondly, I get the sense, apart from the rights protection mechanisms area, that basically you're saying that ICANN is now ready to press the button to go with the work plan that they published with the May launch; is that the consensus view of the GNSOs; second question.

So the first question, are all your views covered? Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, it's not a, we were just giving our own stakeholder group viewpoint. I think, I don't remember hearing from, I think there was Business Constituency that hasn't, didn't weigh in, and I don't

think we heard from the ISPs. But I think as we said before, there are a few issues, some technical ones in some of the documents that came out that just need to be tightened up, things like service levels, really small details. One of the things I wanted to say is if you'd heard the GNSO discussion this morning, it really focused on minute details in a lot of respects which I think is really good news. That from at least my personal perspective, observing it over these last three years, that the issues right now are not over arching huge issues, they're really down into the weeds. So from our stakeholder group perspective it's with a little tightening it's ready to go.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Jeff. Wendy and then Marilyn.

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks. I think first I want to echo Jeff that we have not reached GNSO consensus through these points, but I also want to note that I was saying I see this as a package and if you are to take out some of the increased rights protection, then I might say decrease some of the burdens on those seeking new TLDs. So it's not something that I think can easily be just tweaked and I think we're ready to go with a package from my individual perspective.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Wendy. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Thank you and I appreciate being recognized. I'm the Chair of the Business Constituency, I'm going to give a statement that is probably perhaps more consistent with the statement that Christina Rosette from the IPC made. The BC has significant concerns

about incomplete work. The economic study that has been long committed was not delivered until Friday. It does add new information that we are, we've been very involved in understanding the negative externality impact on the introduction of massive numbers of new gTLDs without appropriate and balanced safeguards. We have other concerns so we feel that that information must be analyzed and taken into account and should result in changes in the several of the present sections.

We also are interested in seeing the, I would think, sort of the strengthening of criteria that make sure that there's not a lot of fall over of new registries and I think all of us probably share that concern. And we will have more detailed comments, but we generally believe that the domain name space should be differentiated and not cloned. So that new gTLDs should add differentiated space rather than just resulting in present registrants having to defensively register, that doesn't create new space. We are interested in seeing a stronger focus therefore on community facing TLDs. I think I'll leave it at that, but I guess the summary would be we're not ready to go.

Olga Cavalli:

Okay, I have Adrian, Christina, and after this two comments I would like to ask the GAC what is their opinion about this new gTLD process. Adrian?

Adrian Ketter:

Excuse me. I just wanted to further clarify, I think from the Registrar Stakeholder Group there is a sense that, and even in the wider community, that the more you leave this open the more

opinion you're going to get. And I think that we've had a significant time for debate and whilst we are as I say, not quite perfect and as the latest round of comments will benefit that, outside of that the longer we leave the window open the more discussion we'll have. And now, and I echo Jeff's sentiment that in doing so you're really just dealing with the periphery and I think at some point in time, no matter how much debate we have, no matter how many protections are put in place, there will always be a leap of faith that is required with this program. I believe that leap is more a step, and a careful and calculated one at this point. So I believe we are ready.

Olga Cavalli: Christina?

Christina Rosette: It's our constituency's view that the guidebook is not in fact ready and that it really isn't the details; it's three of the over arching issues of the four, and that there should not be a launch in May.

Olga Cavalli: Any other comments? Tim?

Tim Ruiz: Tim Ruiz with GoDaddy and a member of the Registrar's Constituency. For the most part we feel the same way as Adrian felt, but I do want to point out that we certainly haven't, we're not happy with everything that's in the applicant guidebook. We're not real pleased with the way vertical integration turned out, but we realize that at some point decisions need to be made and we're willing to live with those. And I think also we believe that if, once we do roll this out, I think the issues we're going to run into and

the issues that are going to crop up that are really going to give us problems probably we haven't even thought about yet. And we're not going to know what those are until we roll this out, there's just no way. And I think many of the things that we are concerned with and we've consumed so much time on we're going to find out were never really the big problem and aren't going to be the big problem that we thought they were. But we can't learn anything until the program is rolled out and we think that needs to happen sooner than later.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Tim. I think it would be useful for the GNSO, in light of this debate that we still have some things to talk about, having the vision of the GAC about this process. If you have concerns, if you have comments for us to consider or to share with us. Sorry, UK, I cannot look this way sorry.

Mark Carvel: Thanks very much, I'm sorry I didn't introduce myself earlier on. My name is Mark Carvel, I'm with the UK Ministry Department for Business Innovation and Skills. Can I just pick up the point I think Tim is making about unforeseen issues that may well emerge. I wonder if with regard to that you have some sympathy with the view that certainly the GAC has advanced on several occasion in sort of engineering best practice terms that you actually sort of limit the launch so that you can do a test run and you analyze the impacts and the sort of new elements are revealed and you address those and then you sort of progress with a further launch and a more sort of secure and knowledge based approach, whether that kind of, as I describe it engineering best practice

approach is one that you have some sympathy with in terms of okay, let's go with it and fingers crossed and it will all work out or if there are some sort of things that aren't foreseen then they will be reviewed.

But it could be we're talking about a massive extension of the generic space. We're talking about an impact on the root which is unprecedented and as you know the GAC has spent a lot as one of the key over arching issues that the whole sort of resilience and integrity of the system is not compromised in any way with such a massive extension at a time when there's DNSsec (inaudible 0:36:22) and IDNs being added to the root as well. So that I think is one question now we'll table and perhaps there will be others too to come out if we have time. Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Tim, you want to address that?

Tim Ruiz: Yeah. I think that to some extent that's been taken into account and there are some limits and parameters placed around you know how many applications will be accepted, how many are going to be allowed into the root and when. And even though those numbers might sound big in relative to some things, in relative to the DNS and the number of queries that it handles and the number of domain names that registries and registrars can carry in their databases and the amount of activity and traffic, it's really not that big.

The limits that have been put on it are very reasonable, probably very conservative in a way, so I don't think that that's a real issue. And we could probably discuss unendingly potential issues or problems, but what we really need to find out is what are the real issues going to be and I don't see any other way to discover that until we actually roll the program out. Otherwise we could be unendingly coming up with potential problems and issues, but I think we've had several years here now, we've discussed several different aspects, technical, policy wise, many different endeavors and I think we've covered the gamut of what we can really foresee as being problems.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Tim. Further questions, UK?

Mark Carvel: Thanks so much. Just a quick question. Do you actually have a figure for the number of new gTLDs that could be introduced, a kind of threshold if you like, that's totally safe, do you have that figure? Which I don't think we have had from looking at the root scaling papers that are available, there seems to be some conflicting sort of figures bandies around, but we haven't seen, I don't think, a figure that says above this number we're getting into slightly, potentially risky territory. Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Marilyn and then Suzanne. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: What I'd like to do as the Chair of the BC, since my council is not in the room, is respond to Mr. Carvel's earlier question and then comment if I could on this question. The systems we are testing

actually are not the question of how many TLDs can go into the root. Root scaling is not our issue, it's an important issue, that question has been addressed. The systems we are testing are the human systems and the ability to deal with the (inaudible 0:39:36) that may exist in multiple, simultaneous applications. This organization has only introduced at one time about 12 new gTLDs and that was over a period of time.

We must remember that when we did that we encountered a significant problem by failing to take note of the fact that we could not resolve in the ecosystem of people who actually run the internet the gTLDs that were above three letters and that created a significant challenge to dot info, dot museum, dot arrow; we learned a lesson from that, but going from introducing 12 gTLDs to 500 without going through a period where you take a smaller number and you do work the system – and I would say, Tim, that working the system means you must put real applications through, but the idea practically that you go from where we've been to 500 it's the human systems and the other systems of people being able to respond to the questions and to respond to the failures that may take place, not just the question of root scalability.

The other point that I would make is compliance and enforcement is a major challenge and I'm not going to remind all of us that that is the area that I've heard the GAC speak on before, the Business Constituency has expressed its significant concern about the lack of adequate funding and support for the present enforcement and compliance challenges we face; scaling that up is a long term effort

---

of training people, and getting them on board. So I do, I say again, I'm speaking just as the Chair of the Business Constituency, business, we're not saying no new gTLDs, we're saying do it right so that users can insure that the registry can work.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Marilyn. United States, Suzanne?

Suzanne Sene: Thank you Olga. I know we are running out of time, but I was just wanting to make an observation and then unfortunately we won't have time to get your feedback, but the GAC has actually gone on record with multiple letters to the Board since the June Brussels meeting; multiple. And while we've had some responses we have not had complete responses and certainly not to our most recent letter. And in that regard I would just sort of, it would be interesting to get your views as to the GACs advice.

We did clarify that we meant advice as per the bylaws, that has a certain legal meaning, and we asked them to provide a rationale for every decision that they have taken written. And some of you may have been in the room yesterday when we had the exchange with Kurt Pritz and Kurt seemed to be suggesting that we should take staff summaries of comments received to date on all of the various DAGs as the rationale. And just to be clear, for those of you who were not in the room, I don't believe any one of us finds that a suitable response to the GACs recommendation to the Board. So we would be interested in your views of the letters that we have written, but regrettable today, we've run out of time. So we'll have to save that for a corridor conversation.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Suzanne. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I don't want to follow that question because it's a big question. I was going to follow up on the root scaling and then I want to actually just agree with Marilyn in one sense about we're not really dealing with a technical issue on the introduction of new TLDs. To give a plug for this great country that we're in now, when dot CO did a re-launch very recently they were able to do, when Colombia did this launch they were able to, we were able to process 90,000 registrations in the first 15 minutes. So DNS is very resilient, you can add a lot of entries into the DNS very quickly. So I think Marilyn's point is well taken that we really shouldn't consider it a technical issue, it's much more of a human issue and how ICANN can process it and whether they can take all these applications and things.

I don't know how we test that. I mean maybe we could have all of ICANN staff get in a room, throw them a bunch of applications and time them and see what they can do, if nothing else it would be entertaining to watch. But yeah I do think kind of what Adrian said, the longer we talk about this the more issues we're going to come up with and at some point you kind of just need to say let's do it. I don't know how you limit in the sense of if you're going to say we're only going to accept 100, I mean even in the sense of you could have more than 100 cities apply and can you tell, if governments support those within their own countries for those

cities, and could you tell one of them yes you can have it, but you can't simply based on a number. It's tough, it's a hard thing to do.

Olga Cavalli: UK?

Mark Carvel: Thanks, I know we haven't got time to discuss anything more really, but can I just pick up on what was referenced earlier on what happens when a gTLD registry or maybe several do fail, what is the GNSO view on that, it would be interesting to have that in writing at some point. Should ICANN pick up the pieces from the mess of a failure or series of failures or do you have some other proposal. It was a question I have as a public policy issue, so something online about that I would be very grateful for. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much. I would just, from the GNSO perspective would like to make a final comment. I like the sentence that Suzanne said, to find ways to facilitate an open and constructive dialogue. And feel free to suggest a way that we, GNSO and GAC, could do that. And I think we have many things to, ideas and worries and concerns that are relevant to this process so that's my last comment. And thank you very much for receiving us and for this dialogue and this comment.

Heather Dryden: And again, on behalf of the GAC, I'd like to thank the GNSO for meeting with us today. I think my colleagues around the table have noted with interest the variance of views on the DAG and the respective constituencies which you come from and in terms of

---

collaborating further, I think you will hear from us regarding the joint Working Group report and that particular aspect of wanting to understand better the rules that you follow when developing policy as an SO and I'm sure that we will have opportunities to discuss this further in the corridors this week so I look forward to that continuing. Thank you.

[End of Transcript]