
Heather Dryden: Good morning everyone. Let's begin. First of all, a sincere thank you to the ccNSO for meeting with us this morning. It seems like it's been some time since we met with you, so I think we're due.

We have a number of issues proposed for discussion this morning; beginning with the framework of interpretation Working Group. We did have a bit of discussion yesterday about this. So New Zealand will be leading on the GAC side on that topic, but I think the GAC has keen to hear what is happening with that Working Group and to see that work begin.

And then followed by that, the ccNSO will discuss the strategic plan, the operational plan and budget that ICANN and highlight some of that work to us; I hope that it's a scenario where we can work with the ccNSO in the future.

And then after that, an update on the names of countries and territory study group, and then the impact of new territory or geo gTLDs on ccTLDs so we have quite a full agenda today.

All right. So with that, can I hand over to Lesley.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you, Heather. Good morning everybody. For those of you who I don't know, I'm Lesley Cowley. I'm the new Chair of the ccNSO and thank you for having us back, Heather. We haven't been together for a while. We hear you've been a bit busy on some gTLD stuff. But we have a lot of different things apart from

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.

gTLDs that we'll see if we can share with you. I'll turn it over to Keith.

Keith Davidson:

Good morning, and for those who don't know me. My name is Keith Davidson and I'm the co-chair of the GAC ccNSO liaison group, and I'm not sure that there is a co-chair on the GAC side at the moment. And that's something we could discuss perhaps a little later on the agenda.

We have prepared an agenda and have speakers for the various pockets, and I wonder if we could pop through them in order and as they are on screen. It's certainly – the screen in the RCC room was very big, and in here it's very small, so I apologize for the size of the type. We do have a time allotment for the various items and speakers attributed, so if we can make good progress, there should be a little bit of time left at the end for just general comments.

And the first topic on the agenda was shared GAC and ccNSO priorities, and that's over to the two Chairs.

Lesley Cowley:

Thank you Keith. So we had some thinking around this, and identified what we believe should be some shared priorities, particularly around security and stability, where we're doing quite a bit of work on the SSR review and also looking at security and stability directly, DNSSEC, an acronym that I'm sure you're familiar with.

And as I know many of you are aware, one of the key things we do at the ccNSO is actually share our ccTLD experiences and just yesterday we had a very good presentation from a registry that had been hacked; and for a registry that has some very good experience in disaster recovery. And that information sharing is of particular value to both governments and to country codes, I'm sure.

Heather Dryden:

Thank you for that. From GAC side, the priorities that we've been discussing I think have been more along the lines of new gTLDs related, and the ATRT recommendations. So I wonder whether we would have common goals in relation to the ATRT aspects, but of course security and stability is something that governments are keen to ensure regarding the domain name system.

And I think some issues that have come up recently in that sense are related to how we work with ICANN as a part of ICANN when there are lots of activities happening outside of ICANN, and law enforcement is one of those areas where ICANN has been conducting an outreach – a great deal of outreach; but of course law enforcement is our part of government, and we think that we are useful points of contact for this organization when needing to deal with governments. And we believe we can be useful to this organization, so I don't know whether any GAC members would like to comment on that particular priority or – yes, Australia please.

Peter Nettlefold: Hi, my name is Peter Nettlefold. I'm the Australian GAC rep and I'm also representing the GAC Chair on the WHOIS Review Team. I think this is one area where we can potentially – or I'd personally be interested in input from the cc community. The WHOIS Review Team has currently got a discussion paper out for public comment, and one of the areas where we would be seeking comment if there is any best practice or better practice examples from within the community that could inform the Review Team's work, so I'd certainly be interested, and I believe the Review Team would be interested in input from the cc community on any examples or information that could be shared with the Review Team.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you, Peter. As you're well aware I'm sure that cc's often have different WHOIS policies, but we already had several presentations from the Review Team, and individual cc's I know will be making input where appropriate to comment.

Heather Dryden: Thank you. United States, please.

Suzanne Sene: Thank you and I don't mean to spend too much time on this issue, but I thought I would share with you a question that came to us during our meeting yesterday with GNSO registrars, and as you may well know, all of our law enforcement colleagues

respectively, have created some recommendations for amendments to the registrar accreditation agreement, and some other suggestions moving beyond that to a code of conduct, and we were briefed from the registrar perspective that a few of the target items that law enforcement has identified, they would find very challenging. And one of them was validating registrant data.

And so they threw a question back to the GAC asking whether we could share our respective national experiences with our cc's. So I just thought I would throw that out to you, because of course we all said, well, that seems like a reasonable thing to do. So I don't know that any of us have initiated that just yet, but I thought I would let you know. You'll all be probably hearing individually from your GAC counter parts, so that we can help nudge the G registrar space a little bit closer to agreeing to a set of best practices. Thank you.

Heather Dryden:

Thank you United States. Did anyone else want to comment on this?

Lesley Cowley:

Thank you Suzanne, I mean I would encourage GAC members to liaise with their respective country code managers on that and a number of other issues. I was just going to add a final point and it's on the agenda anyway, but a major shared priority one would hope would be the work on the framework of interpretation which

we're just commencing about the delegation and redelegation of the country codes and we'll cover that later.

Heather Dryden:

Thank you. Are there additional priorities that the ccNSO would like to flag? No, okay.

So from the GAC side, I mentioned the ATRT recommendations, and one of the things that the GAC has also been working on with the Board is the review of the role of the GAC.

And so we've been looking in particular at the GAC piece of the policy development process. But we're very keen to take the experience of the new gTLD program and find a way to ensure that we don't arrive in a similar circumstance, where we feel government advice is not being taken into account as appropriate, and that's not happening early enough, and that the organization is not set up perhaps to really ensure that community consensus – full community consensus is arrived at, which would include the role of governments.

We're also keen to ensure better tracking of GAC advice. We're proposing a register as part of the joint Working Group report which we have finalized at this meeting, and that we will be submitting that to the Board. And that will be put out to public comment, I believe.

So to the extent that the ccNSO may have similar issues or concerns, if there are ways that we can work together to ensure the

policy development process is working very well, and of course we have plenty of experience in leading PDPs as being an NSO. So I would put that out to you.

Lesley Cowley:

I gather, I think in danger of constructing agenda for our next encounter it would be useful to share your learnings from that experience at that time.

Heather Dryden:

Thank you. UK please.

Mark Carvell:

Thank you Chair, and good morning everybody. I think it's – at this – in this discussion about our joint objectives and shared priorities and so on, I think it's worth underlining that virtually at every juncture in our policy discussions, we're very mindful of ensuring that ICANN is truly globally inclusive that we have the outreach, the stakeholders in developing countries and when major initiatives like the new gTLD round comes along, that it is truly inclusive.

So I'm sure this is an objective that the ccNSO with its registries across the globe would share, but I wonder if actually there is some scope of comparing notes as to the sort of barriers and problems that this community faces in ensuring that this is a truly global organization, that the policy development involves stakeholders

from developing countries and their particular concerns and resource issues and so on are fully taken into account.

So as I say I sort put that on the table really as perhaps something to explore further between the GAC and the ccNSO and maybe there are opportunities that we're missing through the country code registries or relationships of the country code registries that we could develop or other – other ideas, or maybe even issues that we're not yet aware of. Thank you.

Heather Dryden:

Thank you UK. I have Egypt and then we shall move to the next agenda item.

Manal Ismail:

Thank you Heather. Just to highlight another activity that is going on jointly which – between the GAC and the ccNSO which is the IDN PDP Working Group – the Working Group used to have [Yanas] and myself and now it's only me. I'm not sure if he would like to add someone else, but we went through a pause during the past period waiting for some output from the IDN variants Working Group which are being the case studies that have been created by the ICANN, and now we're trying to revive again the activities and see what can be done in parallel; so again, just highlighting that there is the IDN PDP activity going on.

Heather Dryden: Thank you Manal. Okay. So Lesley, can I turn to you to introduce the next topic?

Lesley Cowley: Okay, thank you. So the next topic was the ICANN strategic and operating plan on which we had a great deal of interest in the country code community, and Roelof will speak as the Chair of that Working Group.

Roelof Meijer: Okay, thank you Lesley. I'll just make two remarks on the strategic planning process because that's behind us in fact, and we have just started the process for the next plan.

One of the major comments was the process itself. This time there was no real respect from the side of ICANN for the deadline, so we really got into a tight time squeeze with the submission of our comments.

And second important remark we made on the strategic plan is well the virtual – the almost absence of measurable objectives against which the end of the plan could be determined if the objectives had actually been realized. That's also one of our major concerns in the present operational – or it is in the present operational plan, because it's going to be put before the Board on Friday.

But the present – the operational plan for 2012 has the same problem. After the first round of comments there was some

improvement in this field, but it still lacks for a lot of activities and projects, measurable goals.

Another concern from the cc community is the fact that the costs increased at a far higher rate than the revenues, about double the speed so to speak, because the costs have increased about six and a half percent, and the expenses at 13%, which also means that there is only a very, very small positive balance on the expense – on the expectation of 2012. And that again means that there will be no addition to the strategic fund, the reserve fund of ICANN although that's an objective which is mentioned in the strategic plan.

We have serious concerns about the way the cost allocation is calculated for the ccNSO community. We found out that were a two million miscalculation in the first version of the plan which is going to be corrected, but still we lack any detailed information on how this calculation is done, and you'll probably understand that we have some reservations about the correctness of this calculation if we ourselves find out that there is a two million mistake in there.

We are still unclear about the grounds of the 21% increase in the cost of handling IDN ccTLD requests in 2012. We have very serious concerns about the [hate], the absolute [hate] but also the increase of costs of professional services. If you look at the budget for 2012 including the gTLD launch, there is a 50 million post for professional services, which is about half of the whole budget. And we feel that ICANN is not equipped to cope with the management challenge, that that kind of large group of

professional consultants, consultants will put on the employed staff.

And as a last remark, and we've been told that this problem is going to be solved at the beginning of next month, but the present financial software that ICANN is using does not give us, and also it doesn't give the Board enough detailed information to really steer the organization on effectiveness and efficiency; at least not on financial effectiveness and efficiency. That was about it, Lesley.

Lesley Cowley:

Thank you very much for that Roelof. Are there any questions or comments the GAC members would like to make? I think that the GAC has – has not been directly following the – this process at ICANN, however, I think it is still an important one for us because we take such an interest in the accountability and transparency mechanisms for the organization.

And we do have the topic of funding money certainly brought to our attention on quite a regular basis, and so I had wondered myself whether there would be a way that the GAC could report it's in kind contributions to the organization. I know there have been concerns about noting that this is not an organization where governments directly contribute to, however, there are other ways in which we support this organization in a very meaningful and substantial way. So I don't see requests, oh, Netherlands, please.

Thomas de Haan: Thank you Chair, and I also want to reiterate that on our side, we didn't have – follow this process so much. We had some other heavy stuff on our heads, that's true, it's not – not an excuse, still with report from Roelof, I get some very worried feeling, basically I get the message that this organization is really growing out of its jacket and bursting out of its jacket in quite some uncontrollable direction, financially in the organization.

What I wonder is we have all this – this is more an original question, we have a couple of reviews, independent reviews the ATRT and WHOIS et cetera, I wonder if there's also a kind of independent – where does the necessity of having a kind of independent audit also on organizational matters, financial matters, is there somewhere lying in – is this function somewhere in let's say [belect] in Dutch, thank you.

Heather Dryden: Thank you for that. Lesley, did you want to respond.

Lesley Cowley: Obviously, not speaking for ICANN, but I'm aware they do have fresh audits. I think the issue here is around management of the current information, and certainly we – many cc's run equivalent size organizations and as a practical way forward, have offered to share formats and styles and information in order that the Board who are very live to this issue can take appropriate action.

Heather Dryden: Thank you, European Commission.

William Dee: Thank you and – excuse me, thank you very much, that was quite an interesting presentation actually. I wonder ICANN’s not a new organization. Am I right in thinking that problem goes back several years, this lack of financial information and clarity on funding? Because it seems to strange to me actually that you could expect the ccTLD community to – well, I’m assuming actually, are they asking you to pay more into this part obviously, and do they not need your – do they not need your approval to do that?

It seems very strange actually that they would take this approach and not provide sufficient financial information and then come to you with a demand. Am I mischaracterizing it actually, but I’m a bit surprised to hear that they’re going to approve this on Friday and you haven’t had time to – it was a late consultation, I think, and there’s a lack of detail in the document.

But I mean how is – how is what’s the process here? They don’t need your approval actually to the costs that they project for ccNSO or ccTLD matters and they just go ahead and send you the bill; is that right? Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Keith, please.

Keith Davidson: Keith Davidson and I think speaking from dot NZ to speak to... Historically, ICANN have been seeking to recover some of its fees from the ccTLD community, and I think my first experience was in the Melbourne meeting in 2002, or thereabouts, and ICANN thought of a number of five million dollars, and asked the ccTLDs to pay that. We suggested that there needed to some greater openness and transparency and understanding of what the components of their five million dollars was, and subsequently, we've not achieved any great degree of openness and transparency and the figure has risen to or increased at about ten million dollars.

So there is an ongoing need for us to be able to quantify to ourselves, the component costs that the ccTLDs do pay, either a contract fee for those who are on contracts, or a voluntary fee based on the scales of fees which is not close to ICANN's expectations.

Lesley Cowley: Just to add to that Bill, so your point about the budget, no the cc's don't have a veto over the budget, but we have made input to the ICANN Board who's role is approve the budget. There is also a separate ccNSO Working Group looking at financial contributions that is waiting information from ICANN in order to inform that discussion.

Heather Dryden: Thank you Lesley. Okay so I have Denmark, Sweden, US and Russia, please.

Julia Kahan-Czarny: Thank you Chair, and thank you for a very interesting presentation and I'm sure that we haven't been able to follow this more closely. I mean we are – I think it's worrying – very worrying that the budget and everything and the strategic plan is not transparent, it should clearly be so. ICANN should act in the public interest and they should act responsibly as well. And it's a problem if we are not able to track where the money goes and if – yeah, thank you.

Heather Dryden: Thank you Denmark, Sweden.

Maria Häll: Good morning everybody. Anyway thank you very much for the information, well at least I want to echo of course what some of my colleagues said, I'm – these are figures and information that I actually wasn't aware of, and so my question is more like what kind of process do we have for actually dealing with these kind of issue.

I mean they have, there are some reviews that have been done, are reported, there are some reviews going on, but in this kind of area, I don't know what kind of process or review there actually are; maybe there are no process, so it's a question for you ccNSO who seem to be very informed about this, and have been following up this economical information; so what kind of action do we need to

take and what kind of action are you preparing to do actually?
Thank you.

Roelof Meijer:

Okay, thank you. There are public consultation processes for both the strategic plan as well as the operational plan and budget. The one for the operational plan and budget started I think in January this year, and well it's still ongoing, it's probably going to end this Friday.

It started with what ICANN calls the operational plan framework that comes with a budget. We already had the problem there that the framework was only a few page document very high level, and the budget was quite detailed; so for instance it was very difficult to make connection between the written text and the amounts so to say. But we made quite extensive comments on that version of the plan and we received the second version...when was it, Bart?

Bart Boswinkel:

17th of May.

Roelof Meijer:

17th of May and that's – well that would be the version that ICANN staff would like to submit for the Board – to the Board, so it's quite detailed, and there is a clearer link between the budget and the plan.

We made quite a lot of comments on that version again. In total, in fact we submitted something like 26 comments out of which 13 so that's 50% so far have not been taken into account. I don't know how many other constituencies and individuals submitted comments on the budget process, but it's an open process. So like many others.

Heather Dryden: Thank you very much Roelof. I have two more requests to speak from Russia and the UK. But clearly this is a topic that we can ask for an update on down the road. So with that, Russia, did you want to comment or can we move to the next agenda item.

Oleg Chutov: Not this item. I have – to share, but it's a later item, so next.

Heather Dryden: Okay, thank you, UK?

Mark Carvell: Actually just very briefly, that – the four bullet that IDN costs, IDN ccTLD requests and the costs of those. We talk up the success story of IDN and ccTLDs; weave it into speeches for Ministers and so on. This is just a bit worrying, and I'll be grateful for a follow up note about what this is. Is this getting out of control, exerting a break, you know and that's what I would appreciate, thanks.

Heather Dryden: Thank you UK. I think that's a good question to ask the ccNSO. So with that, can I ask us to move to the next agenda item and who will be introducing the next?

Lesley Cowley: That's Keith Davidson and Frank Marsh.

Heather Dryden: Okay, please.

Keith Davidson: Thank you and I have the joy of cheering the framework of interpretation Working Group; GAC will recall that we spent two years or so in the delegation, redelegation and retirement Working Group, which had the main output of seeking a framework of interpretation and for – really to provide greater color and depth to the issues of delegations and redelegations of ccTLDs.

The Working Group was formed and has been meeting; it's a multi-constituency composition, members of the GAC participating fully. We have a GNSO rep coming on board. We have an At-Large rep on the committee as well as a large number of ccTLD – ccNSO members and other ccTLD.

We've agreed to a work plan and timeline and just about to proceed into our first real tranche of work, with a meeting that comes up this Thursday from 2 pm to 5 pm. And of course our

meetings tend to always be open to observers, so if there are people who have a specific interest in the topic, they're welcome along, and time dependent are able to put their questions.

Just as a process issue, the – we meet very frequently between ICANN meetings, sometimes weekly. Meetings are staggered 80 hours apart each time they happen to give everybody an opportunity to participate since it's a Working Group of over 30 people from around the planet, and we have this very strict guideline that we will not make a binding decision on process of a single meeting on any matter of importance; so that gives everyone the opportunity to – as long as they're participating in two out of the three meetings, everybody will have the ability to say yes or no to any decision along the way.

Now preferences that we – we produce a draft paper for the Working Group to consider, it's in the Working Group's hands a week before the call. We go through that paper in some detail on the first call to iron out any major bugs, and it probably should be noted that at that point once it's had its first reading, it is quite appropriate to circulate that draft more broadly for broader input and so on.

We understand that GAC may not be able to keep up with the flow – the ebb and flow of the drafting and documentation as it happens, but there are strategic points in the work plan where we will go out to public consultation, and they're probably the points where all of the GAC should be strongly interacting with us. And the timeframe for this Working Group is about two years in total,

we're tackling several issues chronologically in a way and the first major topic that comes up on Thursday is the terminology used by ICANN and IANA in the delegation and redelegation reports. And that's it from the ccNSO.

Heather Dryden: Thank you very much, Keith, New Zealand.

Frank March: Thank you Heather, and thanks Keith. Just a note that the GAC discussed the work plan yesterday, and is happy with it, I think and falls short of endorsing it. And if we are going to exercise any early influence on the work of the Working Group, it might be to make some of the papers more accessible to ordinary readers and going to five bullet point's depth, it gets a little tricky for some of us. It's I think – we can accept the fact that the Working Group is going to go ahead and is open to midcourse correction as necessary and we'll be able to provide that if and when. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Thank you for that, Lesley.

Lesley Cowley: In view of the timeline, can I suggest given it's a two-year project; we update you periodically when we next meet on that. Thank you.

We'll move on then to a very brief update on – sorry, I'm so sorry.

Heather Dryden: Singapore, please.

Nora'in Ali: Thank you Chair, first of all – sorry, excuse me. We would like to thank Keith and his team for the very comprehensive and the detailed work you have done and we know that you have come through the several documents, the RFC 1591 and the newest sponsorship agreement and ISO 31661, this I think is a very comprehensive piece and we will recommend it for you. And we will support you know the approach you are proposing in carrying your work forward.

Just one clarification that we'd like to seek from the team is that in the methodology you proposed a facial approach addressing issue by issue, and therefore I think you need two years to complete the study. Is it possible for you know the issue to be addressed simultaneously? Should we discuss it that you can shorten the time of your team's work? Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Keith, please.

Keith Davidson: Yes, no some issues are able to be addressed simultaneously, but it's a question of breaking our work into pieces that can be handled you know in a logical way. For example, just the terminology

paper that we're considering on Thursday is a 43 page quite detailed document. So it's – yeah, it's like eating an elephant, you just have to do it one bite at a time. And I think to rush or try and do too much at once will lead to mistakes or oversights.

So I think you know having been through the work plan twice, everyone is in agreement that the timeframe is about right, and there's not too much more simultaneous work that could happen.

Heather Dryden: Thank you. I have Italy.

Stefano Trumpy: Yeah, a simple question, about the lifetime and the scope of the Working Group in the medium term let's say or long term, because and have you considered the fact that also looking at the IANA NOI, this group inside the ccNSO, could become a little bit operational, let's say with some result, being ccNSO certainly an organization that is international, that is authoritative and could well play a role in doing things let's say. And concerning the problems connected to redelegation and things like that, so this might have a greater policy meaning.

Heather Dryden: Keith.

Keith Davidson: Yes, I take both your comments of course, what we're looking at is the policies and trying to provide color and depth to the policies, but inevitably that spills into what procedural – or what process changes ICANN and IANA might undertake. But we have IANA people on the Working Group who I think will be as well as guiding us, will be looking at the processes as an internal operational function so it's outside of their scope.

Heather Dryden: Thank you for that, UK.

Mark Carvell: Thanks very much, just very briefly. Keith you mentioned strategic opportunities with consultation, and just to sort of underline willingness to engage in that, and if you can give us as much lead time as possible, because some of us will have to consult within administration, some of us have territories, you know not only our national registry, but we've got – the UK's got many territories to consider as well.

So what I didn't quite get from the work plan as set out here was some sort of markers, you know we're going to need GAC input here and so if you can sort of bear that sort of request in mind that we need some lead time and sort of advance warning and allowance of the fact that some of us will have to do fairly extensive consultations. Thanks.

Keith Davidson: I'm happy to undertake a more clarified timeline in the brief sense for the GAC. That's not a problem. I think that the other issue is that we're trying to do with our work program is actually develop chapters you know, discrete chapters of the framework as we go. So I think the timelines of the ICANN meetings are generally the points at which we are going into public consultation rounds in the UK and I'm sure this will occupy considerable time going forward in the joint sessions.

Lesley Cowley: So just to add to that response, the ccNSO is developing a work plan for all of its work, and also very mindful of where elements of our work go into the other constituencies or cut across, et cetera. And so we – I'm sure we can come back to you with more flesh on that plan as it regards to particular Working Groups.

Heather Dryden: Thank you, Lesley. The GAC is also going to be developing its own work plan, so hopefully we can do the same to look at, at the work that you're undertaking and where those linkages are.

So I think at this point, we can probably move to the next agenda item. So who will be introducing this?

Lesley Cowley: Very quick update on the Names of Countries and Territories Study Group from Bart, please.

Bart Boswinkel:

Good morning. It's a bit weird to do this as an ICANN staff, but the reason is that the Working Group still hasn't nominated its Chair, and therefore it's not appointed. So and secondly, although they've been working on some topics, the ccNSO sent out an invitation to the GAC to participate and in all invite to appoint observers or members, bodies more according to their rules.

So hopefully at some time in the near future, we can welcome some GAC members on this topic, because I think there is a very common interest in how the different policies work out with regard to the use of country names and territory names as TLD, and that is precisely the purpose of this Working Group.

So just a brief overview of what this Working Group is about; it's looks at current and proposed, and proposed in this case is – means only the IDN overall policy, IDN ccTLD overall policy for allocation and delegation of country names and territory names as TLDs. So the overview – and the overview is already in a trial version available for the Working Group members, so that bit has been done, but that's the easy one.

The more interesting one, and that's where we, probably the Working Group needs the expertise and the input from the GAC from the governmental perspective is okay, once you have these policies, how do they work out with regard to the different type of country names.

Everybody is clear there is an official name for countries and as I'm Dutch, I will use the example of The Netherlands. The Netherlands is the formal name and some people would call it [Nedlump] in Dutch. But then you have the issue how would you call – what is the status of for instance Netherlands in German, Nederland, what do we do with – according to the current policy and policy after the first round it could used as new gTLD. Then you have – so that's one category.

Then you have another category which is called Holland. If you have Holland, some people would say yeah, that's a very good name for the Netherlands, because people know it, although I'm Dutch, it doesn't represent me as a Dutchman. I live very close to the German border, and if people would say to me, I am a Hollander, or Belgium would tell you that you're a Hollander, he refers to a very rude, loud mouth person. So you have some issues there.

So that's just for the Netherlands and I know this because I'm Dutch. So we need to create this type of policy and we need to understand how the different policy apply to these country names in order to under – to see where the loopholes, et cetera in the current policies and the Working Group has to – all that in the end has to suggest ways forward to deal with it.

So either it could be a PDP, it could be a suggestion to the Board, so recommendations both in principal to the ccNSO counsel, but in fact to all the – probably to all the participating organizations, SOs, and ACs. At this stage, the Working Group has members from the

ccNSO, GNSO, ALAC, and as I said we are waiting if the GAC would accept the invitation to participate in whatever manner they would prefer. That's all.

Heather Dryden: Thank you very much for that, Bart. I believe the next topic should further illustrate some of the substance work and may address some of the questions that the GAC has on this. So let's move to the next. And so who will be introducing this item.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you Heather, so this is the impact of geo gTLDs on ccTLDs and we have Ørnulf from Norwegian – Norway and Anna Beth Langer from dot NO.

Ørnulf Storm: Thank you, shall we just sit here and do it from here? Okay, that's good. I'll just make a short introduction to the subject.

In this regard, as we have discussed, there are national sovereignty issues regarding using of geographical names. And from the Norwegian government perspective the geographical TLDs do have a national identity, and therefore its utmost importance to being able to influence how these are run and under what conditions. And that's also why our Ministry actually formed a Working Group last year to go through and how the Norwegian government should deal with this kind of TLDs and that's

something we can also come back to, but of course we don't have time to do that in detail here.

But therefore it is also important to focus on the support of non-objection in this regard, because when you have – give support you can then empower the governments to set the terms and conditions under this TLDs the government to operate under, or you can then decide to just give a non-objection and then possibly waiver your influence.

That would of course be a according to national policy. So it's really – that's really a national decision if you want to then be able to set conditions and what conditions do you want to then set on this geographical TLD, and I think that would very much be based on what conditions do the existing ccTLD operate under in your country. So that's – that would probably vary very much in each country.

So we can talk a little bit about more sort of what criteria and what conditions you want to send, but we can do that a little bit afterwards, maybe do some discussion on that. I think let's leave it to Anna Beth which also participated in the Working Group with – from the registry side and from government side we were Elise and myself from the regulator, and we also have some other participants from other authorities and business and consumer protection in Norway. Thank you.

Anna Beth Langer:

Good morning, those who don't know me, I am Anna Beth Langer from the Norwegian registry, dot NO. And from the registry's point of view, it is important that these things are sorted out from the governmental point of view. In Norway we operate under a legal framework, and relative similar conditions for a new geo TLD will of course be easier for us to handle than to have another geo TLD in competition with different conditions.

The first thing I would like to say is that it's important that the government, they have given the possibility to give support or non-objection in the applicant guidebook and what we've discussed with ICANN, and the first thing is for a country to decide which authority should give that support.

I've had some questions from people here in this meeting that what if someone comes to a local government out in the countryside, and nobody knows, and they send a letter to the ICANN that we give the support, and the central government doesn't know anything about it.

So I would advise each country to sort out in their country to send a letter to ICANN and say that if you get an application for a gTLD – a geo TLD that is under that regime then that's called a non-objection, this support or non-objection letter should come from X Ministry. So they know that in advance and you don't have complications afterwards. That would be a good start.

As Ørnulf said, it will differ from country to country what kind of criteria we would to set. What we have done in Norway that's

Norwegian, but in another country they will like to do something else, or perhaps just keep their hands off and say non-objection.

For the existing ccTLD, I see a new gTLD in the market could be an incentive for the ccTLD as well, to do what they do even better, if they have a competitor that's more close to what they do today than dot com or the other gTLDs that's non-geographical. So and if the newcomer does – not does a good job, then it might be even more business for the old safe ccTLD, they know what they have, and if they are doing a good job, that might be a good thing for them as well. So I'm not that afraid for our competition, I think it will be quite exciting. Thank you.

Lesley Cowley:

Thank you very much for that presentation. That was very interesting. Did you want to add something Norway?

Ørnulf Storm:

Yes, just a sort of very quickly. We have written a report and it's also available in English and now I'm happy to forward the link to the GAC for – for them to see. And but just to very quickly to just summarize some of the sort of conditions that we identify in this very important for us, if you want to get a letter of support, and we sort of decided that if we should – well we haven't really – sort of the Ministry has not sort of made a final recommendation on policy yet.

But the recommendations we made that were – that it's quite important to have a national jurisdiction over this geographical TLD and therefore we would recommend to have a separate private law agreement with the registry in addition to the current regulation.

And also we have made proposals for it, since we have a regulation in Norway on domain names, we also have made proposals for amending that regulation, and there are other issues that is quite important to ensure that do we want to have equal or quite equal treatment or conditions for this geo TLD, so that's quite important issue as well.

And also then to ensure consumer protection issues, and security, dispute resolution procedures which they operate under. So these are several things that we highlighted that would at least be important for the Norwegian government to set these terms and conditions when we – if we will give a letter of support. But of course it's more elaborated in the report that we have made. Thanks. Any questions, we'll be happy to answer.

Heather Dryden: Thank you very much, Norway, Keith, did you want to comment?

Keith Davidson: Two comments, just with regard to links, wherever or for the entire session today, I have a slide at the end with links which I'll provide

the presentation to the GAC secretary and ccNSO secretary afterwards, those links will be there.

Could I just comment that I was very fortunate to be in Norway two weeks ago, and attend a very detailed discussion on Norway's development of their position on geo TLDS; and I have to say it was a fascinating discussion that you know demonstrated to me how to develop a principle spaced framework that is just very useful. So whether or not New Zealand would agree with the Norway government position, doesn't matter. What we do have is a list of well-thought out principles that we can apply to our own jurisdiction and consider suitable to us. So I think this document is very well worth reading, and it's well worth following up with Norway as to how they developed this. It's a most interesting process. Thank you.

Heather Dryden:

Thank you very much Keith. I know Canada is doing – thinking about this. So we would really welcome taking advantage of the work that you've carried out on this topic. Did you want to follow up on that Norway?

Ørnulf Storm:

Yes, and also one important issue here is now with the inclusion in the applicant guidebook that ICANN will comply with a court decision, legally binding court decision in the jurisdiction of – that has given the letter of support we have of course now the possibility to enforce a breach of these conditions that we actually

set nationally. So that's a really important part of this whole framework. Thank you.

Lesley Cowley:

Thank you. Anna Beth, did you want to add?

Anna Beth Langer:

Just to inform you that when – if you're going to have the same work in your country to make such report, or use the principles, in our view it's important to have participation from all the parts of the internet society or the internet community.

[End of Transcript]