
PRAGUE – GAC New gTLD Discussion
Tuesday, June 26, 2012 – 09:00 to 10:00
ICANN - Prague, Czech Republic

CHAIR DRYDEN: Good morning, everyone. Sorry about the delay. We just had an issue with the microphones.

Okay. So let's begin our sessions. Before we begin, just a note that, when you're sitting at the very ends of the tables, it is difficult to see if you are requesting the floor. A couple of you yesterday explained that you were requesting the floor and I did not see. So please ensure that you do get recognized. And bear in mind it really is a challenge to see the ends of the tables. Okay.

So our first item on the agenda today is the issue of additional protections at the top level, in particular intergovernmental organizations and that will be followed after the coffee break by a briefing on the issue of IDN variants. Oh, actually, I think we meet with the ALAC in between. Yes, we do.

So then we'll have a meeting with the ALAC and then we'll continue a bit on a talk still related to new gTLDs.

The good news is that we will have coffee served outside the room today and tomorrow at the breaks. So I don't know what Jeannie had to do in order to make the deal, but we will have coffee here available to us. So that is appreciated.

So, without any further delay, I am first going to hand over to the OECD, to their head counsel. And we're going to hear a perspective from the

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.

IGOs on this issue. And a number are in attendance specifically to present to the GAC today. So thank you and welcome. And, if you would, please.

NICOLA BONUCCI:

Thank you, Heather. Thank you, chair.

Thank you very much for giving me and us this opportunity to provide what we believe is a long-awaited opportunity to share with you the concerns of the IGO community. Let me stress that I do not here speak on behalf of the OECD, even though I naturally represent the OECD. But, as the Power Point indicates, I speak on behalf of all the IGOs which are listed on the end of this presentation, which is a group of 38 international organizations and, in fact, probably also on behalf of a number of other international organizations which have expressed the same concern.

Let me also say that I am not alone here. I am fortunate enough to have colleagues from the International Criminal Court, ICC; the World Bank; WIPO; the ITU; the CERN; and the union -- and UPU. We're all here and ready also to answer questions to all of you.

If you could go to the next slide.

As a background, some indication as a background.

First, this issue of the DNS is an issue which has been always carefully watched and considered by IGOs who have been there from the beginning. We have expressed concerns about the new system for some time. In fact, if we go back and we look at the various

correspondence, this was even much before the Singapore decision. We have traced at least one letter sent from the U.N. legal council dated 23rd March 2005. The OECD send two letters, one in August and one in October 2010. WIPO sent another letter on 1st of November 2010.

Let me also recall that the GAC itself had previously recognized that special protection for IGOs in the DNS were needed. This is reflected in the 2007 GAC principles regarding new gTLDs, when you called on ICANN to make a proper allowance for rights in the name and acronyms of intergovernmental organizations.

So the question is, maybe from your perspective, is what is your concern and why are you concerned?

Now, maybe without being pedantic and entering into a discussion of public international law, which naturally lawyers would love and we can spend hours and days, but let me regard very quickly what we are talking about.

What is an IGO? An IGO is an intergovernmental organization. The main difference between an IGO and non-governmental organization is that the IGO is created by states, i.e., by you. Not you personally, naturally, but your government and your Parliament.

Because they are established by a treaty. And the treaty is, in all the countries that I know, ratified by your Parliament. So, basically, we're an extension of the states. We are created by the states to fulfill a public purpose that the states have defined.

That's the main difference between us and the NGOs. I mean, I have nothing against the NGOs. The NGOs fill a wonderful purpose. But the main difference is that NGOs are not created by treaty. They are not created by states. They are what we call a typical bottom-up organization. They serve also a purpose. And one can say they certainly serve a public purpose. But, as I said, they have not been created with your explicit approval and with the explicit approval of your Parliament.

There is also another important difference -- and it's not a minor difference -- is that my salary, their salary, is paid by you. Actually, this time it's really paid by you, because you're taxpayers in your countries.

And IGOs are paid by the assessed contribution of the states, which come from the public funds of the states, which, at the end of the day, is taxpayers' money. So IGOs are paid by Greek taxpayers, Portuguese taxpayers, Spanish taxpayers, Canadian taxpayers, U.S. taxpayers. Because of that, IGOs have been granted a special status under international law, again by you, by states with several privileges and immunities. I don't want to enter into a legalistic explanation about what privileges and immunities are.

But, basically, the main idea was okay, we're creating this collective tool from an IGO for whatever we want. We don't want this to be submitted under any national laws or jurisdiction because it has to be independent and, again, because we don't want to waste the taxpayer money in endless disputes in national courts.

So the consequence is that, again, by treaty, because there are treaties also in privileges and immunities, you states have granted us, international organization, privilege and immunities, which means that

we shall not appear in front of national courts and which we shall be protected under international law.

Next slide. What is the basis of the protection, then, of our names and acronyms under international law?

Well, first, naturally, there are several treaties. Apart from the treaties establishing our status and ourselves as an international organization there are several relevant treaties which I will -- I'm sure you're fully aware of. But let me remind. There is the Paris Convention, the WTO TRIPS agreement, the Trademark Law treaty. As you all know, Article XI of the Paris Convention for the protection of industrial property, which was adopted in 1958, so well before Internet, and as further extended by Article 16 of the Trademark Law treaty and Article 2 of the WTO agreement on trade-related aspect of international property rights, protect IGO names, acronyms, and emblems. In a nutshell, IGO names, acronyms, and emblems are the equivalent of the trademark protection without having to go through the formalities or the expenses of registering a trademark or defending your rights.

The obligation, in light of those treaties, again, treaties which EU states have subscribed which have been ratified by your own Parliament, the obligation falls on states and you to prevent any third party from registering or using as a trademark the IGO names, acronyms, and emblems as notified in accordance with the terms of the Paris Convention.

Let me also point out that, under international law, because of another convention that the member countries have subscribed to, which is a general convention on the law of treaties, it is very clear that a party,

i.e., a party to the Vienna convention -- and all parties are parties to the Vienna convention, with one or two exceptions -- a party may not invoke the provision of its internal law as a justification for its failure to perform a treaty. This is article 27 under the Vienna convention.

So under international law, even if your national law is not in line with the Paris Convention or the WTO TRIPS or any other international treaty I'm mentioning, you would still be obliged to comply with your international obligations.

In the advice that you gave on, sorry, 12 of April 2012 to the ICANN board, you expressed a position that GAC would consider formulating advice regarding our enhanced protection if you are convinced that we would meet the criteria of a 2-tiered protection test.

Let me say here first that, as I pointed out, we strongly believe that the real test is the first tier protection test, which is what international law provides for. Because, at the end of the day, those are international obligations that your government had subscribed. And a violation of those international obligations would put your government, your country, in the possible position of non-compliance with your obligations.

But, for the sake of completeness and following your advice, we went through a very extensive study of what national laws say. And I hope and I'm sure that you all have read carefully our current position paper of 4th of May. And you will see that we have attached to this common position paper, 130 national legislation which provide for protection at the national level of our name and acronym.

So, even if we were to agree on the 2-tiered tests, we would fulfill that 2-tiered test. But, as I said, in our view, the first and more important one is what international law provides for.

Let me go to the next slide. I don't want to spend much time on this. Because we believe that at the end of the day what is important is our case according to its open merit. And we believe that we have a strong and legitimate case.

But let me point out only that the slides which you have here under your eyes is factually correct. In particular, in its conclusions.

Let me now move to the next part of my presentation, which is, okay. Fine. All this is fine and good. But, you know, so -- all this is fine and good.

But now why can't you rely on what we have in place?

Well, first, you know, if we were to use the same analogy that we use in other situations like public health, if we were to say, you know, let's stop vaccination because in any case we can cure the disease, I don't think this will fly as a logical conclusion.

Prevention is always better than cure. Prevention is always better than cure. It's true in the health situation. It's true in development. It's true in all areas and it's true in this area.

Secondly, cure has a cost.

And, again, why should we undertake this cost. And when I say it has a cost, we are already undertaking a cost. You have here around the table seven people who probably would not have come to Prague for

that purpose if we were -- had to have been given what we were legitimately asking for.

Now, coming to Prague it's wonderful because it's a great city even though I have to leave tonight. But it costs. And it costs not private money. It costs public money. It costs your money. It costs your taxpayer money.

At a time in which international organizations are asked to make savings, are asked to be efficient, are asked to take care of the public money and rightly so, at a time in which a number of countries are asking their citizens to make efforts, why should we divert our time, our money, to enter in to curative mechanisms where we can solve the issue adopting a preventing approach?

How can I explain to your government representative in the OECD, in the ITU, or in the UPU that I have to pay to buy a domain name and use the Greek taxpayer money or the Spanish taxpayer money or the Italian taxpayer money when there is an alternative which is workable, which is acceptable, and which makes sense?

The last objection that I -- that we have vis-a-vis the current mechanism is that, whatever they provide for, at the end of the day, they don't give any guarantee of a final independent adjudication. Because, in any of the mechanisms, we are not the decision maker at the end of the day. Whatever we say, it's an opinion. It's an advice, you know. I'm not saying it is not with value, but we are not a decision maker.

And for some of them -- for some of them, it requires us to go in front of national courts.

Now, again, why should I spend money? I mean, I love U.S. law firms. But they're for profit. I'm not for profit. Why should I give money to San Francisco law firms or other countries' law firms? No? Why should I give your money for that?

And, on top of that, as I said, this would defeat the whole principle under international organizations were established after the Second World War, which is you need to be independent and you're not submitted to any national court.

You can go to the next slide. I'm sure that you all have the Power Point presentation, so I'm not reading my slides. I always found reading slides the most boring exercise. So -- now, what are we asking for? Next slide.

What we asking for, we believe -- no, thank you. What we're asking for, we believe, is clear and reasonable. And, again, I will not read my slide.

And we would propose to take the 6ter database as the criteria for preserving and protecting IGO name. To make it simple, IGOs which will be protected would be those in the 6ter database.

What is the advantage of that? First, treaty based. This is based on the Paris Convention. Second, there is a verification mechanism. Third, it's a public list. And third is a limited list with clear criterias. Because, in order to be in the database, you have to prove that you have been established by a treaty. And, as I said, it's very clear to know if an organization is established by a treaty or not. A treaty is an intergovernmental document signed by all the countries which have been ratified by Parliament. There is no dispute on what a treaty is.

So, if you meet the tests, you will be in the 6ter. If you don't meet the tests, you will not be in the 6ter database.

I would like to conclude with a few simple observations. And again, I thank you for your attention.

First, IGOs, intergovernmental organizations, believe that they have a strong and compelling case for having their names and acronyms being excluded from registration by third parties in the DNS. At the end of the day, not really differently from what you have for yourself. And again, there is a logic because we are a (indiscernible), we are an extension of states, in a sense.

We believe that we have the same grounds as states and at least an equivalent specific features than the two international nongovernmental organization that have been given special treatment so far.

Point number two, we have offered to you a solution which is clear, uncontroversial, transparent, and objective. It is a solution which cannot be used by any other stakeholder than a duly registered intergovernmental organization under 6ter Paris Convention.

Third, because we are firmly convinced that our case is strong and legitimate, we will continue to push for it. We don't want to enter into confrontation, but I think we are firm on our principles. And I would say even more so now in the light of the strong budgetary constraints that we are all facing.

So let's work together. Let's fix the issue, once for all, to the satisfaction of all parties concerned, including IGOs. This will allow us, then, to work

on more substantive and major challenges that Internet is facing and will face in the future.

Let me recall you that IGOs are also the ones defending public policies in areas which are essential to Internet, like rule of law, freedom of expression, market principles.

We are ready to cooperate and participate in any possible way to this reflection. We are ready to work together and find a solution. We are ready to structure our participation in ICANN in general and in GAC in particular because we believe that these issues are long -- will stay with us for a long time, other Internet issues.

We hope that today's discussion will be fruitful, and we also hope that today's discussion will be reflected in the communique.

And with that, I thank you very much for your attention. And, naturally, I'm ready and my colleagues are ready to respond to any question and answer that you may have.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you very much for that presentation.

So -- pardon me -- at this time I'd like to ask whether there are any questions for the IGOs that are here on the presentation, or comments on this topic.

NICOLA BONUCCI:

I scared everyone.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Yes. South Korea, yes, please.

REPUBLIC OF KOREA: I am Doh-Hwan Kim, Deputy Director, Internet Policy Division, Korea Communication Commission. I am very honored to speak this morning.

We, the Republic of Korea, supports the community of intergovernmental organization and fully agree that it is highly important to protect against the potential misuse of IGO names and their reputation in the Domain Name System, especially under the new gTLDs.

IGOs (indiscernible) their common position (indiscernible) help us to understand better the special status of intergovernmental organization and the weak international (indiscernible) protection.

As a member of this organization, we have not reached the situation that I just embroiled themselves in prolonged and expensive legal proceeding in order to protect their names and acronyms in the DNS.

It will (indiscernible) definitely divert funding, time, and human resource from their own missions of public interest, and this is definitely not what you want.

Annotated in GAC's letter to ICANN Board in April, GAC has set up the criteria of two-tiered protection test; at first the international level's role, international treaties and through national roles in multiple jurisdiction.

Now, we see the -- we see that the IGOs meet the criteria, and based on this justification, I strongly suggest that GAC should accept the request

from the IGOs for the exclusion of the IGOs names and the acronyms from restoration by some parties in the DNS.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, South Korea.

Switzerland, you are next, please.

SWITZERLAND:

Good morning to you call. I am going to speak in French.

I hope the verbal team will follow us.

It is not necessary to remind you that Switzerland is the home of multiple international organizations, and it is one of the reasons why the problem that we see today concerns us.

It is evident that the Swiss government provides its support to the action of international organizations and wishes the GAC to progress in the same manner.

In the same way that states have a special treatment for the country codes, we believe it would be normal that international organizations, which also come from the states as our colleagues from the OECD have just said, these should also benefit from a particular or a special treatment.

Finally, I would like to say that if international organizations do not obtain this particular status and they need to devote finances that are

important to protect their acronyms in the Internet system, this approach is not acceptable to us.

I, frankly, need to say that the money needs to be devoted to projects of the international organizations, such as the support for development countries instead of having to pay; pay for lawyers, pay for consultants, and pay taxes to register the acronyms.

Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

CHAIR DRYDEN: And Portugal.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair, and good morning, everybody, and thank you very much for the presentation. That was very clear and concise and articulated the issues, concerns, and also the particular interests for governments, for the taxpayer and so on very, very clearly. That was very helpful, indeed. Really appreciate that

It is time to discuss this issue. We all well recognize that. And it's great to have this opportunity with you and colleagues from the IGOs attending here to hand to -- to help us take this issue forward.

And my question really is, I was wondering if you'd had time to look at the preliminary GNSO issue report on the protect of international organization names in new gTLDs. To their great credit, the GNSO Council has moved forward on this issue and commissioned this report. And if you have had a chance to see it, I expect you will have. It does contain a recommendation that the GNSO Council consider whether or

not to initiate a PDP, policy development process, as an approach to develop any additional policy device with regard to creating additional protections.

So I was wondering if you have a comment about that, about that process which the GNSO Council has initiated. And given that now we're beyond the first application for new gTLDs round, the list is available and so on, whether you have a comment on what's happened with the first round as well. I was wondering if you had any reflections on that.

So I'm grateful for your comments about that. Of course, the GAC and the GNSO will work together on taking these issues -- this issue forward, and a lot of us on the GAC will be very interested to engage and assist with this process that the GNSO Council has initiated.

Thank you.

NICOLAI BEZSONOFF:

Thank you, Chair, and thank you to the U.K. delegation. And in fact, your intervention is so timely because I forgot to mention this point, which is indeed an important point.

Yes, we read the report, and, actually, the OECD together with a certain number of international organization has put public comments to the report. And I will ask my colleague -- I will ask my colleague, who is not listening to me but discussing with her friend, I will ask my colleague to distribute now, with your indulgence, our position paper, our response to the GNSO.

I know it's paper, but that's it. We should be better in environmental protections.

But on the substance -- You will see our reaction. On the substance, we continue to believe that the best way forward is the one that we proposed. We would be concerned about the PDP process which would be without any time boundaries or any time frame because unfortunately the experience has shown us that -- and I am not saying this in any disparaging way but, you know, democracy a painful exercise as we all know. And this takes time.

And more than ever, time is money, so we don't have time. And we don't have money, actually, either. Which also is a way to respond to your second question. No, I didn't take time to go through 1,900, or I lost count. And to be honest, why should I spend my time and, therefore, your money to look at 1,900 applications and possibly come to the conclusion, and now it's relevant but I couldn't possibly know without having seen this. And this goes to the original sin if I may use this Biblical expression. Why should I use taxpayer's money to go through a list to see if there is something that I need to do, where there is a way which is very simple which is that there is a guarantee that there is no possible confusion in the list, because we would be out -- we would be protected. We would have been protected.

And I really regret that, indeed, I will have to use your money, my staff money and, therefore, your money, to go through this list. And to make things even more crazy, not only I have to do it for the OECD but all my colleagues have to do the same, for their own purpose. So we are multiplying.

We're multiplying this. Actually, you know that very well because you are facing with the same issue yourself.

And it will be sensitive and sensible.

So, now, on the list, I have to reserve my position. I am told prima facie that there might be no issue, but I don't know. I have to check. I have to check.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you for that response. I have Portugal and Norway, please.

PORTUGAL:

Thank you very much. I will be speaking in Portuguese.

As the members of the GAC do know, Portugal defended in other meetings, and especially in Costa Rica, the fact that the names of the governmental -- international governmental organizations and the OIGs should be protected beforehand in the gTLD's record.

The reason presented by Portugal in the previous meetings, though they have not been legally documented as part of the IGOs that are involved here, are actually the same reasons. These protection sudden be guaranteed by -- or under the reasons we have put forward here, and for principle reasons as well.

But for Portugal, it is very clear that because there are nongovernmental organizations, these protections that are mentioned, such as the Red Cross and the International Olympic Committee, these

protections should also be given to organizations that are more qualified for this kind of support to receive this kind of support.

That is why for a number of reasons they should be admitted and we should consider these reasons of principles that we mentioned before. And secondly, now, under these circumstances that it was created, there are also background reasons.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Portugal.

I have Norway next and then a request from the UPU to comment.

Norway, please.

NORWAY:

Thank you, Madam Chair.

Yes, thank you, sir, for that presentation from the OECD on behalf of the IGOs. I can feel your frustration and I can say welcome to ICANN.

Of course, as you know, we also, as government representatives here, we also use sort of other governments' money to come here and sound the public policy issues from our governments.

And as you also pointed out in your presentation, you touched upon the gTLD principles that was produced in March in 2007 where we also asked for protection of IGO names.

So I think that is a good sort of starting point as well for this discussion.

We will not have time to go into all the details now at this session here, but that is what we try to do as governments, to get a consensus based and get ICANN Board to make the decisions to protect and to listen to the public policy interests that we think is very important.

We at the GAC made some advice regarding protection of certain names and acronyms. And on the basis of this two-tiered test, I think with the protection of international treaties and local laws as well.

So I think in the following, I think it would be very sound by the GAC to also, if other names and acronyms do have the same protection as the ones that has been given in this round, I think it would be a good idea for the GAC to discuss that and maybe then to provide that for the consecutive rounds for the gTLDs. At least for the top level.

I am not go into the discussion about the second level. That's a whole sort of separate discussion and much wider discussion as such. But I think your presentation made it very clear and a very good basis of the further discussion in the GAC. I think it gave us very useful information and useful arguments for our further discussion on this issue.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, Norway, and I think that provides us with a useful way to help structure an approach going forward on these issues. UPU, please.

UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION:

Thank you, Madam Chair. I would love to speak in my native Portuguese but I'll stick to English for the moment. To follow up on

some of the considerations already presented by OECD, and again we thank them for taking this initiative and for speaking on our behalf. It's - - we're obviously -- we wholeheartedly agree and support the approach that has been proposed.

I just would like to go back to Mark's question, the UK representative's question. And highlight once more that UPU, some of you may recall, we have already had some very constructive discussions with the GAC over the last years concerning the dot post top-level domain and some of -- most of those discussions, especially those before the GAC, they concern exactly similar matters of principle that are applicable to the intergovernmental organizations. So we're happy to have obtained your formal support back then and things are moving rather smoothly for the launch of this domain.

But to -- again, to go back to the UK's question, the UPU also submitted already a number of comments which are based on the -- the document prepared by OECD with just a few changes here and there. And they are publicly available for the GAC members to take a look at their fairly extensive comments which are meant exactly to clarify some inconsistencies that were present at the GNSO entering our preliminary report.

I also would like to recall, and this is contained in the comments that we submitted, that any -- any such approach to be adopted by the GAC and/or ICANN has to be based on an objective standard and on an accurate legal basis. So we -- we have to recall again that ICANN, including without limitation its advisory bodies, their activities have to be consistent with the articles of incorporation and bylaws which

determine that this organization shall carry out its activities in conformity with the relevant principles of international law and applicable international conventions and local law. And this is again in line with the GAC's own mandate to consider and provide advice on the activities of ICANN as they relate to the concerns of governments, multinational government organizations and treaty organizations, such concerns being conveyed to you at this very session.

So if there is one group within this whole organization which is supposed to abide by these principles and supposed to provide clear and unequivocal advice to the ICANN Board, this is called the GAC, as far as we are concerned. So we come forward here and we present those principles and those statutory provisions so that you can -- or you are able to provide this clear advice to ICANN in any further establishment of policy. So we cannot stress enough the importance of the GAC in this -- in this equation so that the Board can take really correct assessment and take the best decisions in the interests of the member states of those which are members of those organizations.

So again, we thank you for the opportunity, and just a minor remark in terms of the so-called two tier test, again, I think Nicolai expressed it very clearly that even though the IGOs have provided you with extensive information, even on the domestic law, provisions which apply to the names and acronyms of intergovernmental organizations, this test should not be regarded as valid legal doctrine because we have many jurisdictions around the world which do not require the enactment of domestic laws to ensure application of the treaties that they have subscribed to. So, Madam Chair, thank you for the opportunity to speak.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you for that. We are running out of time. So I have two more requests for the floor and then we will close this session. So I think it's la Francophonie, is that right? Yes, please.

ORG. INTL. FRANCOPHONIE: I'm going to speak in French. Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I would like to say something on behalf of the International Organization of Francophonie that is an intergovernmental organization that grouped 75 member countries and was created in 1970. I would like, on behalf of the International Francophonie Organization, thanks to the group that has presented this report and gave really very good arguments. I'm not going to touch on them again, that they have our full support, and our organization thanks and supports every word that has been said.

I want also to thank to the group of countries that uphold this position and would let us deliver what we're supposed to do. We are here with many of the states to serve the states and these resources has to be carefully considered. I support really this proposal and thank you to the GAC.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, and Denmark, please.

DENMARK: Thank you, Chair. And thank you to the OECD and other representatives of IGOs for your presentation. I think it's been very helpful to clarify your argumentation and I think it would be a very good foundation for putting this discussion forward in the GAC about whether we can

extend the principles used to protect the Red Cross and the IOC to other organizations. That would be a discussion we would support and which we have also put forward before in August 2011 on the GAC list and so I think now that we have your clear arguments we have a very good foundation for that discussion, and thank you once again.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Denmark. And we have one last request, Senegal, please.

SENEGAL: Thank you, Chair. I will be brief. Yes, to thank OECD for this clear presentation and really appreciate the clarification. And on behalf of Senegalese government I fully support the protection of the names and acronyms of international and intergovernmental organization on these new gTLD process. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Senegal. Another request.

JAPAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Unfortunately I can't find any IGO names in the application list. Japan will also share this position and also supposed to start discussion introduction and protection for IGO names in view of public interests. Thanks.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Japan. I see another request. Apologies. I'm not able to identify the particular GAC member. Yes, please, but please identify yourself.

PAKISTAN: This is (saying name) from Pakistan. There is a suggestion that the issue highlighted by the IGOs are highly critical in nature. It's suggested that the GAC may discuss the IGO's issues on the same matter with the Board during the GAC and ICANN Board meeting scheduled to be held today at 1645 p.m. today. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. Okay. So with that, I think we can draw this session to a close. Thank you very much for the presentation today. I think you have been well heard and the issues are clearly identified and we have taken note of your presentation and the document that you've circulated in relation to the GNSO paper. And we will bring this matter forward, I think with a particular focus on a second round or the future in order to address that. But clearly there needs to be more discussion within the GAC about the details. But I think we have a good approach going forward. So again, thank you. And all the best. We're meeting now with the ALAC so if you could please stay seated, we're running a bit behind.