
HELSINKI – Three-Character Codes as Top Level Domains (TLDs)

Tuesday, June 28, 2016 – 12:00 to 12:30 EEST

ICANN56 | Helsinki, Finland

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Gema, are you ready? Yes, great. Because we have one last session before our lunch break.

Thank you.

Which is same same but different, as people say in Thailand. It's similar to what we discussed yesterday but it's not exactly the same. It's about the three-character codes as TLDs. While we had two-character codes as SLDs yesterday, so it sounds similar but it is slightly different.

And I'd like to hand over to Gema from Spain. She has been spending quite some time and energy in dealing with this issue, and thank you very much, Gema, for taking over.

GEMA CAMPILLOS: Thank you. We have a brief presentation. Can it be uploaded?

Meanwhile, and not to lose time, I will try to focus the discussion on this issue by separating it from yesterday's conversation.

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.

Today we are dealing with any domain name, second-level domain name, that is registered under a three-letter code, which could be supposedly a new new gTLD.

The issue here is to what extent three-letter codes, specifically codes in the ISO3166 Alpha-3 codes could be registered as new gTLDs.

This possibility was excluded in the Applicant Guidebook. So no applicant could apply for ISO3166 Alpha-3 code. For instance, the one for Spain is ESP.

Now there is a working group, joint, Cross-Community Working Group sponsored by ccNSO and GNSO that was formed to study the feasibility of allows three-letter codes as gTLDs in future new gTLD rounds. They will also study the feasibility of having country names as top-level domains, but they have not started the study on this issue. They are now focusing on three-letter codes.

So this working group sent a questionnaire to different SOs and ACs in the month of September last year to gather input as to whether these three-letter codes to be allowed or not.

The questionnaire covered all three-letter codes. Not only the ones on the ISO list. And covered, also, three-letter codes in IDN characters, not only ASCII characters.

The GAC replied to that questionnaire on December last year. We provided initial input, and that initial intellectual property reflected the variety of views among GAC members.

I underline some of the statements that were supported by most of the GAC members.

We, as the GAC, or most -- sorry. Most GAC members showed support for keeping the current protection; that is, keeping three-letter codes aside from being delegated as gTLDs. And the reason why is because many GAC members think that there is a strong association among users between those three-letter codes and the corresponding country or territory, and that risk of confusion should be avoided. The confusion could extend also to the ccTLDs. The user could not be able to tell whether that domain -- that top-level domain is a ccTLD or is a gTLD, because in his mind, he would associate that letter code, three-letter code, with a country.

It's important to note that of three-character names, there are 17,576 combination -- possible combinations, and ISO codes only account for 300. So 300 names could be out of -- out of the - - of their use as gTLDs.

In Marrakech last March, this Joint Working Group issued a so-called straw woman paper with a possible approach to the release of those three-character combinations as gTLDs. So in

this paper, they explained the reasons why in future rounds three-letter codes, ISO three-letter codes -- they are only dealing in this straw woman proposal with ISO three-letter codes -- could be available as gTLDs.

The work -- The GAC working group on geo names, the one that is chaired by Olga Cavalli, I don't think she is here now, has prepared a response to this straw woman paper. And in this paper, we explain the reasons -- in this response, we explain the reasons why the current protections should be upheld in next rounds.

As this response has been prepared by a working group, it is submitted now to the whole GAC for endorsement following the guidelines for the operation of working groups in the GAC.

So the questions that are put forward to you now is to comment on this -- this response, this draft response that has been sent to you with the briefing package, or not. Maybe -- Olga distributed it on the mailing list, but it is available to anyone.

And then I think there is a session on the protection of country and other geographic names tomorrow, although I'm not sure if this session is hosted by the working group that I have been talking about, the Cross-Community Working Group. But it could be an opportunity for interested members to express their views as regards to this issue.

And I remind that there are six GAC members that are following this cross-constituency working group, but you are -- others are also invited to join this working group and defend their positions.

So with that, I open the floor to you, to hear from you on this draft response, whether you support it or not. And that's all.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Just one thing. Thank you very much, Gema. Since we have a little bit more time for this session, and remembering that yesterday's session on the two-character codes on second-level domain, there were many requests for the floor -- in particular, from developing countries -- I would suggest that we use the last ten minutes or 15 minutes, depending on how this goes, to give the floor to those who have not been able to speak and express their views on the two-character codes discussion of yesterday, because that was very short and we had to cut the line of speakers, and that is unfortunate.

So those who have wanted to take the floor on that yesterday, I think we should give you at least ten minutes at the end of this session to make your voices heard.

So thank you, and I give back to Gema. And the floor is open to you.

GEMA CAMPILLOS: I see Denmark, Sweden.

So Denmark, please.

DENMARK: Thank you. And thank you for the presentation.

We have put some comments in the process and received some answers on Friday. And we still have some comments to the proposal. So we will propose a certain amendment to it.

I can say -- I can say what the oral suggestion will be.

First of all, if I understood you right, and you said yourself, that the straw woman's paper was only on the ISO codes. So I think our response should only focus on the ISO codes. So that is one thing. Other three-letter codes seems also, in one way or another, to be mentioned here and included.

The other point is that it is still stated that there is sovereignty issues connected with this, and I have -- I have difficulty to see what kind of sovereignty issues which are involved here. So we would like to see that that part of the proposal will be deleted.

And on the second page, the two last points, I have difficulty to see what we are aiming at. The first part of bullet -- the last bullet, and the bullet before that. Especially, to be frank, I don't

understand the contractual restriction to use of top-level domain names consisting of ISO codes are difficult to enforce. I don't know. If it's contractual, why couldn't it be enforced? So I really don't understand the first part of it, and we think it would be appropriate to delete it. The same with the last bullet and the first part of that bullet in our view should also be deleted.

Thank you.

GEMA CAMPILLOS:

Sorry, Finn. Could you repeat what parts of the last -- of your last comments, what do you think should be deleted? Can you repeat that, please?

DENMARK:

Yes. If you take the last bullet, then delete from "the importance" and down to "fair," "we can have fair, transparent, and appropriate policies." So the first part of that. And also on - - on the bullet above, if we delete the first part of it, "contractual restrictions" and down to "on the other hand," "then on the other hand" should be rephrased. So that is what we would like to see deleted.

We would also like to see deleted any reference to sovereignty issues because we don't understand that, and we will also like

that the paper only focuses on the ISO codes. I think it's clearer now.

GEMA CAMPILLOS: Thank you for clarifying. Then I have Sweden and Iran. And then Norway. Sweden declines. So next Iran. Kavouss?

IRAN: Yes. Thank you, Gema. Are you dealing with the two -- the ccTLD to the use of the ccTLD in the second level or you're talking of the two letters? Which one you're discussing?

GEMA CAMPILLOS: Now we are on the top-level.

IRAN: When there is a proposal to delete something, you just take your proposal but don't delete it directly because we have to agree to delete something. I don't think that on the proposal we should delete or retain. This is number one.

Number two, we had at various occasions mentioned.

That we have difficulty with the principle used in the ICANN for that. As you mentioned yesterday, we need explicit agreement of the country but not implicit agreement. If there's any

question or request and after deadline of two months there is no reply, this should not be considered as agreement. Because of the difficulty of developing countries. I am developing countries. We have difficulty to reply within the two months. This should not be understood or construed that we agree. It should be construed that disagreement further to discussions. This is very serious problems. And as mentioned yesterday, there are many things that are the top-level domains used for people, they want to use the, for instance, .IR for some things, for the strings, that we don't agree with that. You remember that the GAC had this agreed in one string totally, but NTIA was given to that, saying that this is the situation. We don't oppose to what has been done before. But this is very serious issue. The resale is very serious issue. You give it to someone, you agree, but you don't know who sell it to someone else. The abuse is very important. So as I mentioned yesterday, we need to indicate that this is still under discussions. We have not yet completed. What you mentioned yesterday is important. We need to inject the explicit agreement rather than implicit agreement. And we need to discuss the issue of resale, issue of the abuse, and many other things. So this issue is not completed. Thank you.

GEMA CAMPILLOS: Norway and Indonesia. After Norway, if you don't mind, I would like to comment on what Denmark has said. Yeah, but Norway now.

NORWAY: Yes. Thank you, Gema. We just want to -- we support in general this -- this paper to be -- before we can agree on minor changes. That's not a problem. But I think it's important in our view to focus on the main issue that this document says, that the three-letter country codes can be strongly associated with relevant country and the existing ccTLDs. And therefore, the conclusion is very important, that we do not want to lift the protection of the current three-letter country codes. I think that's the main issue and in our view that's -- that's very important. And also we want to underline that also in light of all the discussions we have had on protection of country and territory names in general, I think it would be not wise at all to open up for new top-level domains for these three-letter codes. So I just want to again say that the conclusion in this paper is quite important to maintain the current protection of the three-letter country codes. Thank you.

GEMA CAMPILLOS: Thank you. I take note that Netherlands is asking for the floor. I would like to react quickly to some of Denmark's comments.

About the sovereignty issue, Iran gave me an example. The sovereignty concerns over three-letter codes are mentioned here because many countries consider this so intertwined with their identity that they think it is a sovereign right of the country to decide whether others should use the identifier for the country or not. This is mentioned here because of that reason. But there is also another reason. The position of Iran, for instance, is that they could require explicit consent by the country to use that domain name, that TLD.

If you remember the Applicant Guidebook geographic TLDs needed the recommendation of support or not objection by the relevant government. What happens if a territory which is not an independent one is applied by a registry to become a gTLD? If the rule is maintained, ICANN could require a recommendation of support or non-objection by the relevant government. In case of disagreement between the -- the colony, so to say, and the -- the mother country, the metropolis, ICANN could have a very difficult decision to make and that could affect especially ICANN. This is the second reason why sovereignty issues are mentioned here, because we don't want ICANN to get into trouble with -- with countries in this respect. And the contractual restric -- the difficulty to enforce contractual restrictions is because in the proposal, in the straw woman paper, they say that -- their conclusion is that three-letter codes could be used as gTLDs on

the condition that the legal entity applying for the string must not market the TLD in competition with the existing two-character TLD. That condition, we think that it's difficult to enforce. How can you determine that the gTLD in this case is being used in competition or with the intention to cause confusion with the ccTLD. It requires somewhat subject -- subjective judgments. And what happens if a ccTLD registry wants to apply for that three-letter code? Could that be prevented from using it as a ccTLD or what happens if a government applies for the corresponding three-letter code? Could not be the government allowed to use that name for geographic purposes or whatever? That's the reason why it is stated that these contractual restrictions would be difficult to deal with. I pause here, and I have Indonesia.

INDONESIA:

Yes. Thank you, Gema. Yesterday you mentioned that if a new two-letter names is proposed and so on and the country needs time to consider that -- yeah, sorry. Yesterday you mentioned about if two-letter is proposed and the countries cannot respond in the time there will be a problem and yesterday you mentioned that silence doesn't mean agreement. And because of that, my friend from Iran also mentioned that sometimes in some countries they may need more than two weeks or three weeks or whatever to respond. Now, I would like to know what

is your group's idea to overcome this because some countries might need more than a few more weeks to do that, to respond. And even in some countries may not be able to respond as well for many reasons, then we have to find out a way out for that.

Secondly, like Mr.-- the previous speaker, Mr. Jonathan mentioned about the accreditation, it's -- in your group you also do something like considering accreditation system for the ccTLD operators. If the operators cannot -- or the country cannot respond in a few weeks and so on, that will also affect some sort of accreditation of the TLD operators like what Jonathan mentioned just a few moments ago about accreditation that can affect a country if they give information to the law enforcement agencies which is not in line with the regulations. Okay, thank you.

GEMA CAMPILLOS:

About the time needed by governments to express their views on the use or their identifiers, I don't think that's the issue right now on three -- on the use of three-letter codes as TLDs. We are just thinking whether we want the current protection to be lifted or not. This is a simple decision or -- not simple but it's a simple question to ask. We are not now asking whether governments should react or not. Just simply there is a prohibition on the Applicant Guidebook and the proposal put forward by the cross-

constituency working group is to lift it. And we are discussing here whether to lift it or not. So I think your question now is -- is not very relevant. But I can take you -- take that up with you bilaterally if you wish.

And on the second question of accreditation, I'm awfully sorry about that. I don't really understand what you mean. But again, as time is of the essence, I can try to understand it bilaterally with you afterwards.

Then I have the Netherlands.

NETHERLANDS:

Yes, thank you, Gema. I agree completely with your last remarks in the sense I was going to say this also. The question now is as you said, do we need a decision on this? No, we don't need a decision. We just have to convey our concerns on the potential lifting of, let's say, this restriction. And, again, I think we -- one thing I'm missing is what is the need? Are there special applications or registry business plans who would meet this lifting? And then we can talk further, I think, because then we can look at whether we should accommodate these. It's not like the general decision, "Okay, let's lift one restriction." So I would like to know more about, yeah, let's say, what kind of communities or maybe ISO countries because I could expect that in one country, one ccTLD is saturated and you might need

a second code to alleviate and to give more of your habitants or businesses more chances to register the name. So there could be a lot of things that are behind it. But I don't understand still the need for it. Thank you.

GEMA CAMPILLOS: Japan.

CHINA: It's China.

GEMA CAMPILLOS: I'm so sorry. Go ahead.

CHINA: Thanks. Thanks, Gema. First of all, thank you for leading this work in GAC. And at present stage on this issue, we have quickly go through the paper, very quickly, very brief, but not go into detail very much.

Presently, we are of the view on this issue that the three-letter country codes should be protected for sure and should be associated with two-letter country code unless a country or a particular territory has open view on its own three-letter country code, unless a particular country or territory is open for its own country code. That's it. Thank you.

GEMA CAMPILLOS: Thank you. Thank you, Netherlands, as well. I didn't thank you before.

Sweden, please.

SWEDEN: Thank you, Gema. So getting up to speed, we're asked to react on a proposal that came on Friday which was before this weekend, which gives us very -- very little time. It's not very satisfactory.

As a general comment, Sweden is positive to make use of three-letter codes. We can see that some countries have issues with that, but we would be interested in finding a way of doing that.

It has been possible for two-letter codes on second level. So we believe it should be possible to do three-letter codes on top level as well.

Whether or not we support to give this as comments from the GAC, it doesn't seem to me from reading the paper that it has the shape and form to be handed over as GAC comments or GAC input. It looks more like an internal character. So for us it's hard to support this as a response at this time. Thank you.

GEMA CAMPILLOS: Thank you, Sweden.

Iran, please.

IRAN: Thank you, Gema. The question is as follows. You mentioned a very constructive and simple way protection to be retained or to be lifted.

There are three options. Option one, the issue is still under study until we finish our study.

Option two, it could be lifted for those countries that they explicitly announce that the ccTLD does not require protection in this area.

Third, you put it that the delegation of that should be subject to explicit agreements of the countries. So there is no black and white. There are many options between the three things but perhaps one which say that could be lifted with respect to those who announce explicitly that they have no disagreement with respect to the lifting or waiving the protection. That simplifies the issue of many countries who have no problems and also simplifies the countries that have difficulties, difficulties that they have not yet -- the issue has not yet been studied, many issues, abuse, (indiscernible), and many other things.

So I don't think that you have a simple answer yes or no. There are a variety of options. So maybe I come back to my first option that still the issue is under study. And we could also indicate that to the ICANN board, that do not decide on this until the study is completed and they have clear advice from GAC in one way or another. Thank you.

GEMA CAMPILLOS:

Thank you. Thank you very much, Iran.

There was one at the back. Are you Mr. Morris? Okay. You have the floor.

TAIWAN:

Thank you, Gema. I'm Morris Lin Mao-Shong from Taiwan. This is my first GAC meeting. I'm very glad to hear so many different opinions. Like many other colleagues say, Taiwan also believe people tend to naturally associate some three-character country code with some specific country so that the location of a three-character code as a TLD should be more careful. It is important to balance public interest in the business demand, and we understand it takes time to find a mutually beneficial solution.

We appreciate and welcome the starting point for discussion in the strawman paper.

However, for the time being, we think the (indiscernible) of applicant guidebook is still a good one before we find a better approach. Thank you.

GEMA CAMPILLOS: Thank you very much.

Now, I have Wanawit from Thailand.

THAILAND: Thank you. I will make it brief. I also do support what Iran proposed. We have to be in the study stage, especially the experience we have on application guidebooks.

I have a concern on the procedures of geographicals, especially the terms they use, that the applicant should have the agreements or support or non-objection from the relevant government agency.

The problem there is that if you read the next clause, there's no obligation. They use the words "applicant may consult GAC representative." Which relevant government? And you will find out they can go to the ministry of something that's not related to the Internet at all. They aren't aware of the public policies that led to this. They can go to the Ministry of Livestock or Ministry of Agriculture and get the support letters. Is that government

agency who is going to tell it is relevant? And there are no specific clauses specifying to the applicant that they must consult the GAC. I don't get the reasons why they don't put application there. In the country that do not have the GAC, I fully understand who are going to make a decision on which relevant governments involved that can issue the support, a non-objection letter. In Thailand case, we are used to dealing with six ministers, each issue non-objection letters. None of them is coming from the Ministry of ICT.

That are some of the aspects. It's very early stage if we adopt the geographical chapters and using the terms specified in the application guidebook -- because this is not the geographical as a whole country. And for our legal frameworks, we start working out this. Even have to go to the parliament because that's the only way because it treat as the agreements between no matter it's private entity or somebody against the national asset, that you need to go through the parliament. Thank you.

GEMA CAMPILLOS:

Thank you, Thailand.

The last persons in the queue are Norway and Gabon, if I'm not mistaken. And then we need to finish this discussion to leave some room for the other issue.

Norway.

NORWAY:

Thank you. Thank you, Gema. When you went through all the different types of potential, say, difficulties that we might go into if we lift this, I think it's interesting to see that it is -- a lot of issues is not how governments have said yes or no and it's about other issues that I think we need to think more about before we lift something. This is about lifting. This is about changing the current situation, which for now is preserving some sort of system of a distinction between the CCs and the gTLDs.

And I think if we also are commenting on the comment from Iran that we have all kind of different solutions, yes, we have. But we will also create kind of, I think, more chaotic system or not a system or destroy the current system of the CCs and the Gs that are -- they have different agreements with ICANN. They are, in fact, different in nature. And we will see a more complicated mix of those if we lift the current situation.

So for now, we think it's better to preserve it as it is. Thank you.

GEMA CAMPILLOS:

Gabon, please.

Thank you, Norway.

GABON: Good morning to everyone. Thank you, Chair. We don't have much time. But we have been closely following all the interventions on such a delicate issue. And I would like to express my support to Iran's proposal to have more time to give an answer to this topic. Thank you.

GEMA CAMPILLOS: Thank you for your concise comment. There is one more comment from a remote participant.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Yes, thank you, Chair. It is from Estonia, Timo Vohmar, stating that Estonia would like to start using its three-letter country code, which is EST, and also stating that we also think that the three-letter codes are available as long as the country is not explicitly declared their non-interest in the country should be considered as ccTLD instead of as a gTLD. I hope that was clear. Thank you. End of comment.

GEMA CAMPILLOS: We were to wrap up, but there was a hand at the back. Who is it?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's me.

GEMA CAMPILLOS: Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We also support Iran's proposal that we need more time to provide an answer. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Thank you. I think there is some indication about where potential concerns may be in terms of that every country in the end should be able to do with this as it wants as big idea. Those who want to use it should be able to use it. Those who want to keep it or give it to somebody else so that, basically, the sovereignty of the country to decide what to do with that name is something where we may go towards something that we could agree.

The question is: Where are we in terms of the time line? Is this -- are we supposed to give advice to the board now? Or would we rather address something to the cross-community working group that is dealing with country and territory names, which is organizing the session that I think we also participate -- is it tomorrow or today? This afternoon? It's tomorrow afternoon.

So I'm not fully clear, to be honest, whether it makes sense to give advice to the board now or whether we should rather engage with this working group and whoever else has an interest in this.

So, Iran, maybe you have a clear vision on what the next steps are.

IRAN:

Thank you, Thomas. Yes, you are right we should not open -- remain open this issue for years. So we have to have some time frame. Perhaps we specify that at our next meeting. Perhaps GAC will have a reply to that. For the time being, you have to study whether you study giving it to the working group or not. But that is something that among those study, the option 2 that I mentioned is a valid option. People put disclaimer that they don't want to be used or disclaimer another way, that they have no problem to be used. That is one option.

But we do not give it right now. We further study to see whether there are other options, but we establish a time frame. Next meeting in Hyderabad we will give reply to the ICANN, to an appropriate GAC advice. In the meantime, we study.

The way how to study is up to you and up to the chair of the group and so on and so forth to the discuss the options that I

have mentioned plus many other options. But we have to get it informed to the ICANN that for the time being, no action should be taken in this regard. We don't want to be before fait accompli, things has been done. No. Get hold. Don't do anything. Wait for us. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. Before giving you the floor, if I remember right, we have received a letter at some point in time from the working group that was asking us about some questions from the three-letter codes. And I think Norway prepared the draft, answered our proposal. That wasn't picked up because we are all buried with IANA transition and other stuff. So I think we have never really answered that letter. So I think the first step would be to engage -- Karine, am I right or am I wrong?

We answered it so we gave a first reply. Have we received a reply on our reply? No.

Okay. So but I think the next step would be to engage as many of us as can in the discussion, and then I know that, Olga, you are going to say that you're the only one so far that has been participating in the working group. Are we now more in the working group?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Of course.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Chair.

First of all, I would like to mention and to thank Norway and other countries, and Greece, but the most important thing is to thank Gema for her magnificent work with this issue because I was very busy with other things and she catch up with all this, drafting this document.

So many thanks, Gema, for this.

I think we should -- we should give some messages to the -- to the cross-community working group and I am not sure if perhaps we -- we should include something in the communique that we are reviewing this and this is an important thing for countries.

I'm not sure if we still have a definitive idea of what the whole GAC wants, but some message should be sent.

And no, I'm not the only one in the cross-community working group. Also Greece is participating, so they helped me through the IANA process. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Very briefly, Norway, if you still want --

NORWAY: Well, yeah. Thank you.

Just a quick comment. I think we also agree with Olga that we should provide a response, at least some views in what direction the GAC wants this to be.

And just a quick comment to also support what Iran was saying. We are not defining how and when to go forward. This is a cross-community working group that we must actually respond into, to be able to interact, because they will then just go ahead and decide and recommend to the GNSO and then they will start to actually do this.

And then the next issue this cross-community working group is going to discuss is opening up the country and territory names as top-level domains, not only the three-letter country codes.

So we need to convey some ideas that we have to be cautious about lifting current protection, et cetera, in light of all the discussion we have had on protection of geographic names in general or -- or names or three-letter associated with our territories.

So one -- some kind of response, we should at least give. Not possibly, of course, a conclusion or the one way forward, but some concerns, at least, we should convey from the GAC. I think I've heard a lot of concerns about how to protect certain issues, if this is going to be lifted, so I think there is a consensus that we -- we have that, of course, as you said, shared that some countries want to use it as CCs. I think many countries do not want to use it as CCs. But of course this cross-community working group is discussing how to use these three-letter codes as generic top-level domains, not as CCs. That's not on the table yet. So thank you.

GEMA CAMPILLOS:

Thank you. Thank you very much. I understand from this conversation that the GAC as a whole doesn't endorse the response that has been drafted but I have a procedural question.

Could it be possible for the GAC geo names working group to send that response on their own behalf, as a GAC working group, to the CCWG, or is this not possible?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Well, the working groups, first of all, they would need to discuss and adopt the text as a draft that they would put up for

discussion, but I think the first step is, let's go to that meeting tomorrow. Let's discuss -- bring these issues up with regard to three-letter codes, with regard to country names, because in the end the principle is the same. You -- countries want to decide themselves what they do with the names that they think are linked to them, whether it's a two- or three- or four- or five- or whatever letter code. The principle, in the end, is the same. And engage with the working group and see where they are, and then I think we can have a discussion what is the best way, time line, and format, to engage.

But I think we will know more after tomorrow's discussion, if we participate in that, if I can leave it here.

We are five minutes over but I still would like to give the opportunity, if there is a wish for one or two statements regarding the two-letter code discussion on second-level, if there's -- somebody wants.

Iran, please be short. Make your points. Thank you.

IRAN:

Yes. Short, making my points, the same procedure, same problem stays with the alpha 2 and alpha 3 codes, so the same procedures. We should say we are studying that but I still

believe that we should indicate in a qualifying manner some time frame. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Iran.

Other requests on the two-letter codes on second level?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, Olga.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Chair. If there are other countries that would like to also be part of the GAC representation in the cross-community working group of use of country and territory names as TLDs, it could be great.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you for that clear message.

Other requests?

So I think this is the end of this session, but please note that the two-character code discussion on second-level domains is at a

different stage in process. They have already -- there have been release requests and so on, whereas what we've been discussing so far is something where there has -- no decision has been taken on how to deal with this in the future so we have to -- it's similar reasoning, it's similar concerns behind it, but there are different processes and there are different stages, so we have to be careful in the details.

So with this, I'll let you go and have dinner. Lunch. Sorry.

[Laughter]

In French, it's different. So -- and we meet at 1:30, so it's a short break, but it's a short meeting, so we can also have short breaks.

Okay. Thank you very much. See you soon.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]