
HELSINKI – Cross-Community Session: Country and Other Geographic Names Forum
Wednesday, June 29, 2016 – 15:15 to 16:45 EEST
ICANN56 | Helsinki, Finland

CHERYL LANGDON ORR: Ladies and gentlemen, if you would take your seats with your beverages, if you don't mind.

I probably don't need to use the microphone, but it helps the people in the back corner who are welcome to step outside and continue their private conversations. Indeed, you may get up and leave at any time, but please pay attention to the topic we are dealing with here in this afternoon's cross-community forum.

Today's thrill-packed and exciting adventure, and I will continue at this level until I don't have to be the schoolmarm speaking over the chattering people, is on country and other geographic names.

And I'm now sending in the big guns. This may not be pretty, ladies and gentlemen. Bart is on his way to clear the hallways.

I have sent the hall monitor out.

Right-oh. In a slightly calmer, now, state, as only the last of the stragglers are taking to their seats and getting themselves in the Zen moment of this afternoon, I hope you're all relaxed, I hope

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.

you're all caffeinated, and I hope you all don't mind the fact that we've called you to order relatively close to time.

We do realize that there's been a little administrivia hiccup where there's still a number of the publication, the forward-facing screens and things, saying that this meeting is in the Helsinki Hall. We've made sure that there's a sign down in the Helsinki Hall to have anybody who has got lost down wherever that is to come back up here. But at this point, we don't want to run too much later because we have got a lot of time this afternoon for you to interact with each other and to interact with us.

And this afternoon is all about hearing your voice, especially if you are not a voice that we regularly hear on these matters.

We are not interested -- Am I engaging you closely enough, Iran - - to hear what we have heard before and again and again. Exactly. We are very, very, very keen to hear from not the usual suspects.

So let's get this ball rolling and let's get the first slide. I know there's a clicker or some magic happens, but let's have our next slide, shall we?

And we have a drum roll, hoping somebody is making the magic happen.

Do I look like a patient person?

If I had a clicker, I would operate the clicker. All right.

While they're getting the next bit clicked over in our Adobe Connect presentation, I want to tell you a little bit -- there we go -- slight different to how we're going to be running this afternoon.

As you've seen in the last two afternoons, you have our wonderful staff -- an example there, Bernadette, number 2 -- with a sign that says a number, with a microphone. You each have a sector. There are today four sectors, and if you have been in these rooms before you know how that works. You get their attention. They make sure you get the microphone. We make sure you get heard.

But look to my left and to my right. Are there some handsome gentlemen there? I believe so. I have a number 5 and a number 6, and later on I will be auctioning them if they are game. No, I won't. I promise not to. Well, we thought we might, but we've decided not to.

And what Peter and Jonathan are going to do is act as your moderators. And they're going to be roving moderators. They're going to make sure that new voices are heard and they're going to make sure that we also have a good time this

afternoon, because this is serious stuff, but that doesn't mean we can't have a smile and a bit of a giggle on the way through.

Quick background to the forum. This is just to frame what is going on right now and what is already ensconced in our system.

There is a wide range of country and other geographic name related policies, processes and discussions within ICANN. Many of you will know that. Some of you may not. But here is a list.

New gTLD Applicant Guidebook, specifically section 2.2.4.

RFC 1591, dear to so many of our hearts, especially if you have done the Framework of Interpretation work, which use -- it specifies the use of ISO 3166-1 for the country codes.

Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement. IDN ccTLD policy and fast track, the 2007 GAC principles regarding new gTLDs, and the 2007 GNSO final report on the introduction of new gTLDs.

Let's not stop there. What's happening now, looking at this topic? The GAC working group on the geographic names, the Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs, and the GNSO PDP on Subsequent Procedures in New gTLDs. And I'm exhausted just saying it.

This is kind of complicated and there's a lot going on, and all the work that is going on is worthy and good. But what we're going

to do now, if I can have the next slide, is have a discussion and see if we can, at the end of today, answer this question.

Let's have a sharing of information. Let's have a sharing of opinion. Let's hear each other's voice, but see if we can come up with an outcome that gives us some guidance in the following. In the light of all these parallel activities, is it feasible to develop a harmonized framework on the use of country and other geographic names in the DNS?

And to that end, the poll, if you are logged into the Adobe Connect room, and I would like to think that many of you will do this, log into the Adobe Connect room and there is a poll with a short version of that question, and in a moment we'll be able to say yes, no, or maybe. On my screen it says the poll is closed, which is disappointing because I was planning on keeping the poll open for the whole of the session. But what we're hoping is if you are a maybe right now, you may be a no or a yes because you'll have crystallized your decision at the end.

That is enough from me. I'm just going to help the trains run in the right direction. And I'm now going to hand over to which of you wonderful gentlemen to start off with. That will be number 6, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Is my microphone active? Great.

So good to be with you all, and thanks for a very dynamic introduction, Cheryl. I know many of you, and I hope many of you know me. I participate in this -- in ICANN through the Registry Stakeholder Group, through my professional relationship with Afilias, but here I've been asked to be involved as a moderator and as a facilitator to try and help get the conversation going around the various subjects.

Effectively on the sort of GNSO side, you will hear from Peter here in a moment. So we have a GNSO and a ccNSO person. It's clear you have an overarching question which you have been asked and you will be well familiar -- or some of you will be particularly familiar with the different areas of activity and how broadly they cross. We'd really like to get a sense from you and get active participation. And as Cheryl said, the poll in a sense is a fun way but it's also a way of testing the temperature of the room and feeling.

So in the light of current circumstances, this poll is not a question of whether you would like to walk away and exit from the whole question. It's actually a poll about how you might feel about things, how things are actually going.

So, Peter, over to you and then we'll pick it up.

PETER VERGOTE:

Okay. Thank you very much, Jonathan.

Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Peter Vergote. I'm working for .BE registry, DNS Belgium. So as Jonathan has stated, I'm more clinging towards the ccNSO side. However, our registry is a bit of a strange beast because we're also running two new gTLDs. So we have a bit of experience in both camps.

Like Jonathan said, neither he, neither me, we are not the experts when it comes down to deal with issues like country and geographic names. That's to your advantage.

We are in the absolutely neutral zone and our goal of today is to get as much interaction with each of you as possibly can be. Because there is no yes or no or there is no right or wrong answer at the end of the session. But the people from the Cross-Community Working Group would like to know a sense, a temperature of the room or even some new view so that I can use this as building blocks to proceed with their work.

So in order to kick off this session, I would go back to you, Jonathan, and have you fire the first question at the audience.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I don't know if I'm going to quite fire it at you. I think we can start off from where we are, actually. And it would be very good to get some sense.

Many of you will be working in some of the areas. Many of you will be impacted by some of the points. It would be very useful to hear and understand your views on the feasibility.

Do you think it is feasible? Should -- Is this something we should be trying to do? And if so, have you got any concrete suggestions about harmonizing this so that, across those different areas where we -- where geographic terms impact the different parts of the work of the community, is it possible, is it reasonable, and what are the ideas to make that feasible?

And I think number 3 is already keen to talk.

CLARK LACKERT: Yes, hello. I'm Clark Lackert. I'm working within the Geographical Indications Committee of the INTA, and I'm a chair of one of the subcommittees.

I think it would be very helpful if we got the latest comments from the GAC on the draft that was circulated in 2014 in London. And, in fact, I rose at that meeting to make a comment about international law.

What we need is after numerous written comments were made in 2014, and if we want to move this harmonize sayings forward, I think it would be helpful for us to see where is the GAC at the moment, make the drafts available to the community, and then we can provide our input. And I think that will be helpful in moving ahead in harmonization.

Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay; thanks. That's reasonable to hear, but what we don't want to do is get entrenched in existing positions of advocacy.

If it's helpful to the conversation to hear quickly, if someone is willing and able to do so, great. If not, I'd bring you back to this question about other mechanisms to make things feasible. That's one way of taking a step in that direction. Let's hear if someone is willing to elucidate as briefly as possible the current status within the GAC.

CHERYL LANGDON ORR: Two.

INDONESIA: Thank you. My name is Ashwin from Indonesia.

Just share comments about use of names of a country and geographical names.

I think this was -- this is -- this varies from time to time and from place to place. When .ASIA was introduced a few years ago, I don't think there was a problem. But a few years ago when .AFRICA was trying to be introduced, and you have a problem. I was having a joke with my colleagues. If .ASIA is re-introduced today, what will happen? Should there be a conflict or not?

When a software called Java is used, everybody in Java say, "Oh, our island is becoming more, more, more popular!" But if you are not (indiscernible) the Java, perhaps not everybody is happy.

So these are the kinds of things that the question of names of country and those geographic names from time to time and place to place.

Moreover, it will be also affected by the -- what you call it? The other names. For example, if we are using indonesia.id, .ID for .id.google or .id.twitter, whatever, perhaps people will be happy with that. But if we are using .id.d, perhaps Indonesian people are not happy with that.

So it may change from time to time. I'm not saying that I'm fully correct. I mean, I have to check with, you know, with all the

people, but at least this is my personal view that this is a function of so many aspect. And that's the reason why we in the GAC, we always want that this kind of names related to the country will be consulted with the GAC from that particular country.

Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yeah. So these are very good current examples. And for .ASIA yesterday might be .EUROPE tomorrow. And then, of course, how does that impact on .EU. These are good questions, and the GAC might well want to be able to have the opportunity to have a position, but the question is how do we produce some form or is it feasible and is it reasonable to produce some sort of reliable, predictable framework? Because the challenge is we've got multiple and potentially conflicting frameworks, multiple and potentially conflicting pieces of activity and an environment in which it's not -- I mean, I think what many of us -- Certainly if I talk from a business point of view, one would want a reliable, predictable framework within which to work, and I'm not sure we have that right now, and I expect many of us would appreciate that.

So let's hear.

CHERYL LANGDON ORR: Go ahead 2.

EDMON CHUNG: Hello, this Edmon Chung. Sorry, I'm kind of a usual suspect, but I wanted to respond immediately because .ASIA was brought up and I think it's quite relevant to the discussion.

When .ASIA was introduced, actually we did go through a process to engage the GAC at that time. It wasn't as rigorous or, you know, in this particular round, but that was one of the reasons -- I guess one of the experiences that created in this round how we deal with some of these names. But I think going forward, there probably needs to be further framework on this. And here the question -- I'm not quite sure you're talking about - - I guess you're talking about TLD, but it seems to also be talking about second-level domains as well or not? I just want to clarify on that. And the -- the topic of country names and the topic of geographic names may be quite different. You know, country names are much more confined defined set whereas geographic names, even city names or even mountain names or river names became -- become geographic names, and that seems to require a very different set of rules to think about. So just those couple of points.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Edmon. And I put you on a mental clock, so if you had gone any more than about another 60 seconds I would have said too much for a usual suspect but that was perfect.

Just to answer your question on the TLDs, I think you've made some observations which may have helped others think about what they want to say next, we're specifically talking top level. Okay?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Number 1, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Number 1.

ELISE LINDEBERG: Thank you. Is it on? Okay. Thank you. My name is Elise Lindeberg. I'm from the Norwegian government in the GAC. On the feasibility to develop harmonized framework was the key question, as was said, on geographical names in the DNS, we -- we have seen all different documents and processes in regard to the geographical names that you have listed. And for the GAC I think the current -- current situation on the -- on the top level is that we are having diverging views as it is now and that we are

still working on the -- a process to develop final GAC advice on that. So we haven't concluded. But speaking on behalf of Norway, not on the GAC, we see that we have an Applicant Guidebook from the first round. It's been a product of a give-and-take of a long, long, long discussion between the whole community and the different sources that was put on the list. And so the -- we think that the current status of the Applicant Guidebook is a central question for where we go from now. Are we going to change it? Is it so that we change all of it? Do we -- if we can't agree is the current status in the Applicant Guidebook the one that we have to relate to? So I think this is a key question for the further discussion. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Do we have another -- yep, 5.

PETER VERGOTE: Okay. Thank you. I think -- I think this is a very important point and it triggers something that I would like to throw into the audience is the question what we already have in terms of the Applicant Guidebook. Is that -- because this has been the result of enormous, tremendous, debate, is this something that we should use as a starting point and then build up from there or see that there is no common understanding or common finding in going any further or is the approach more, according to you,

that we should say no, let's start with a white cloth on the table and look at everything from that perspective? So I would very much appreciate to have any feedback on that question. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: In the back sector, can I have some microphone to what I guess is sector 3? Thank you. It's on its way. Okay. Ready to go. 4.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Peter. Donna Austin. As somebody who was involved in that discussion of what ended up in the guidebook, I think it's useful to understand how we got to that point and I think that history shouldn't be lost. And I think it goes to what the GAC rep from Norway was saying. So I wouldn't like to see the history lost because there was a lot of discussion to get to that point, and I'd hate to see us kind of backtrack now from, you know, where we got to. So I understand the interest in this. It's a very sensitive topic, but we did spend probably three or four years on it to get to that point in the guidebook in the first place. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Donna. Number 5.

PETER VERGOTE: Okay, thank you very much, Donna. Your point makes perfect sense to me. Are there any people in the room that have a different view or is there a commonality that this is actually making very much sense and that what is in the current Applicant Guidebook is a very excellent starting point and should not be redone or questions. Any reactions, please?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right. Let me help you here. Put up your hand if you think we stick with the Applicant Guidebook as she is writ right now?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Well, just if I could say, Cheryl, it's not necessarily Applicant Guidebook. It's Applicant Guidebook on this topic. Effectively making it a baseline from which we work because Ashwin pointed out that things move on over time and we need a baseline to work from or do we throw the book out and start again.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Forgive my shorthand, Jonathan. That's why you're here to look after the G space. Well done. Let's try that again. Jonathan, you restate the question so we'll have it.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Can we take the Applicant Guidebook as a baseline from which we work, especially given the context in which it was presented, that that was developed through a multistakeholder process and with a great deal of work, is that a reasonable basis from which to work?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Don't have to speak to it. Just put your hand up if you think it is the case. This is a yes -- yes or no. We're just getting an idea. Okay. Gives us an idea. Thank you. Should we ask about the no vote, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Sure.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If you don't think it's a good idea, one person over here who doesn't think it's a good idea.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Why not?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. Here we go. The microphone is yours. Number 1.

WANAWIT AHKUPUTRA: From the Applicant Guidebook you -- the reference of geographical names is referred to 3166 which there are certain problem on translation or Romanizations for the non-ASCII. And if you refer to the United Nation group of expert on geographical names, it might be difference translations happen there. And I used to follow up this issue, in fact, ICANN used to visit UNGEGN and ask about this, and from what I remember in ccTLD fast tracks that UNGEGN was referenced to -- as the reference to the geo terms. And I just wondered in the current Applicant Guidebook is not the reference to the UNGEGN so that's why I say no.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. So that's an interesting point. So it may be satisfactory as a baseline in Roman script, but -- in ASCII, but once you go into non-ASCII it starts to weaken as a baseline. But that still gives us a potential baseline.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Number 4.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Want to make a clarification as a member of the 3166 (indiscernible). The whole 3166 is not about geographical names. It just happens that there are some names with

(indiscernible) areas but this is -- and if I remember the guidebook properly, it's only used as one of the sources of geographical names. So please don't put any magical powers into the use of 3166. Let's not confuse the matter there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We promise not to make any magic with 3166. I promise, Jaap.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you for that point of order. I just got a very good suggestion from the room. If you're speaking on the microphone, please always state your name and your affiliation. Thank you.

So while I'm at it, I have been hearing from governments and from the gTLD namespace, I would say, that I'm looking for my own home ground. I want to hear from the CC -- from the ccTLDs. Is this more neutral to us as a ccTLD or do we have any strong opinions on the matter? CCs, speak up, please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Would you like to clarify.

GRIGORI SAGHYAN: Thank you, Grigori Saghyan, .AM ccTLD. So I think the problem is a very -- very complex. It's impossible to resolve. And I vote that

it is impossible to have harmonized framework. I was member -- I was a member of this study group for ccNSO for geographical names and a member of working group on geographical names. There was a survey which was provided -- organized by a study group. There was a lot of questions which were sent to governments through UNESCO. Study group have collected lot of information, and at that time I understand that it's impossible to have harmonized network.

So I think the right way is to find a way to work around.

My suggestion is -- I have sent my suggestion to the working group -- to have a -- in order to don't have any confuse -- confusion of user, we can use the same -- same strategy as we use when we use HTTPS. Everybody see that it is secure connection because it's green. In case of countries, I think it will be possible to add in the browsers for country names a flag or -- I don't know, flag of the country or to have a bold or to underline that it's a country code. Everybody will understand that it's a country code. And if it is GNSO -- gTLD, we will have situation as we have today. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. But there you're talking about -- sorry, Peter. There you're talking about to the right of the dot identifying somehow in the browser whether it's a gTLD or ccTLD. And you started off

by saying you thought it wasn't feasible. I just looked at the poll, and the poll is indicating that around 80% of you think it is feasible to have -- or may be feasible to have some kind of harmonized framework. So I think it would be very good as well to hear, in addition to the simple hands-up indication, to give some reasons why so it starts to put a bit of substance onto that over and above the point about the Applicant Guidebook.

PETER VERGOTE:

Okay. You stole a bit of my question, Jonathan, because I was going to ask well, this looks like a very interesting point of view to have it in the browser. How is that technical feasible, if it's technical feasible at all. I don't know whether we have any technical experts in the room that can shed some light on this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

(off microphone). Microphone 4.

JAAP AKKERHUIS:

Well, I will point out that domain names are not only used in browsers. They are used in numerous places. Sometimes you don't see them. And then also browsers are used to -- by people who cannot see but hear. And, you know, it's kind of -- to be honest, it's a non-starter. I mean, you -- there is no such thing

in protocol which tells you what the color is of the domain, it's just a string. So it's technical impossible.

PETER VERGOTE: Okay, thank you, Jaap. That was a pretty straightforward answer to the question. As Jonathan mentioned, the results of the poll -- this is, however, a remarkable result that we have, such a clear preference for the ones that think that we can actually come to a harmonized framework.

What I would like to do is to see what's the temperature in the room and is it different, what we have on the poll.

So could any one of you who thinks that it's possible or that it may be possible to come to a harmonized framework, could you please raise your hand, please. Was my question not clear?

[Laughter]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maybe not.

PETER VERGOTE: So the poll says currently that about 80% -- I have understood that right, haven't I, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: (off microphone).

To be accurate, 53% of you say yes. 17% of you say maybe. So in combination, that looks more like 70% are thinking it may be or is possible to have a harmonized framework on the poll.

PETER VERGOTE: Okay. Thank you. So on average we have 70/30. So who of you thinks that it is possible or it may be possible to come to a harmonized framework? Please raise your hand.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No penalty to raising it or not, but it does help frame -- give us an idea. Your voting at the moment, are you? Okay.

PETER VERGOTE: Okay. There was a question or an observation there.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, Susan Payne for the record. I suspect there may be some confusion from people about what they are being asked. There's a question written: With all these parallel activities, is it feasible to have a harmonized framework? My answer to that would be no.

But when the question is being asked in the room it is: Do people think it is possible to come to a harmonized framework? Well, maybe yes but I would still say no, not if there are activities happening in three or four different places.

Do we not think it's a problem that we may have three or four different groups coming to different conclusions? How can we reach a harmonized framework by acting like that?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Susan. That's very helpful because, as you point out, knowing what you are trying to ask is very different to reading what the question says.

And really the concern is there's a bunch of parallel activities. There's a lot going on in different places, and there are also established rules and procedures.

Is it feasible -- not with all these parallel. Is it feasible to either terminate these parallel processes and start again or to do something else, some other form of activity that makes it -- that will give us a practical, feasible outcome to a harmonized framework?

And we've had -- one suggestion is yes, and base that on the applicant guidebook as a starting point.

So reactions, points, and thoughts about whether it is possible to have a harmonized framework and, if so, how we go about that. And raise your hand if you want to speak, and the roving mics will come to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We have Number 2.

ORNULF STORM: Yes, hello. This is Ornulf Storm from Norway in the GAC. Just a quick comment on this question. I think the question is possibly phrased too complicated because as our previous comment that my colleague made, that we already have a framework for the use of country and geographic names in the DNS, which is actually the applicant guidebook.

So I think the question would be to -- how to develop that framework. Or I think some might want to have -- that if it's not available for use, it is not a framework for them to be used. But a framework that also have some protection mechanisms is also a framework. So something that's -- maybe you have to phrase the question differently. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: And that's a good point. And so should we be carrying on activities on broadly the same point, the geographic names point, in multiple different areas?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 3.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Excuse me. The question is not appropriately raised, not your question. We should start: Should we take coordinated activities with a view to arrive as some degree of harmonized work? The most important, this parallel is not efficient, is not productive. We mention today in somewhat earlier. We should have the coordinated activities. Put all our efforts together in the coordinated, harmonized activities with a view to arrive at some degree of harmonization with the action. That is the question that we have to raise. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: And do you have an opinion as to the answer? Do you have an opinion on the answer?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: In my view, it is, yes, we should do that and we would arrive at some degree of harmony. We cannot arrive at absolute

harmonization. Impossible. Cultural diversity, religion diversity, policy diversity would not allow us to have a fully harmonized thing. But we should and we could arrive at some degree of harmonization, yes. But we should activation -- actively coordinate activities together. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Seems to be support for coordinated activity, which by definition potentially means scrapping the other existing activity. So that's important. And it seems that there may be still some limits but the advocacy is to at least give it a try.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 1.

NICK WOOD: Yes, thank you. Nick Wood. I agree with Iran. Isn't the process the policy development process? Isn't that how we should be doing this?

PETER VERGOTE: I think with the last couple of answers that we have that this debate is really going into a kind of acceleration. So it actually brings us more to the question, and I don't know whether we would have a straw poll on that or not. But it's a tempting idea.

The question is evolving in: Should we as soon as possible really stop with as much parallel activity that there is ongoing there and look for one single new working group or study group or whatever we want to call it to tackle with this and to address it and to be ready for a future gTLD round.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: To the extent that they're future gTLD rounds, I mean, this is GNSO policy. The applicant guidebook was GNSO policy. There was advocacy earlier for that as a baseline. So really in a sense, what's -- what I think is being proposed is GNSO policy with the applicant guidebook as a starting point to work from.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Annebeth, please.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Thank you, Annebeth Lange from .NO. I just wanted to say a few things about what's happened before because I've been here for 17 years now working with a lot of this stuff, first from the governmental side and been working with geographical names for years and years.

The last process we had, that ended in the applicant guidebook. It was a long, long process, five years -- about five years from the beginning. And until we had a compromise in that 2.2.4.

And it was give and take. Some government and some others wanted more protection, and some others on the other side wanted no protection. But this is a compromise that we ended up with after a long, hard work. And that was a PDP from the GNSO with input from the other stakeholders.

So in many ways, I see that should we throw that -- all that overboard and start again? It had worked quite well. And as long as we don't agree on any other solution, we have something that we have already agreed on, even if we didn't get everything we wanted, all of us.

So let's not ruin what we have already achieved. If we can kind of make it even better, good. But in many ways, after all these years, I see so many different views here, it's difficult. And we shouldn't start to quarrel again. Let's keep on the good work and start with this we already have and perhaps find it even better, if it's possible. Thank you.

PETER VERGOTE:

Okay. Thank you very much, Annebeth. That was a clear point, a clear vision from your side.

Is there -- according to you, is there any way how we can combine a number of things? Have some of the work that has been going on, have it saved as a kind of reference and, in the meantime, try to stop with the parallel tracks as soon as possible? Would that -- according to you, could that be a way forward?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Why is there parallel activity going on? If, indeed, we have a multistakeholder developed, satisfactory broadly solution in the applicant guidebook, why is there additional work going on on the subject?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I have got Number 2 and then Number 5 and we will give you the microphone back so you can answer that question. Four, I meant to say 4.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes. Roberto Gaetano. I think that -- I agree with the latest comment from Norway, from.NO. Let's do with what we have.

I think that we cannot think of getting a perfect solution here. And there's the risk of losing more and more time on something that is without a solution. And I tell you my opinion on why this

is a problem without -- without a solution that can be good for everybody.

We seem to be unable to make the distinction between a string and content. We are fighting on the -- a string that is just a word or whatever. And I think that this becomes important only when content is associated to that string.

That means when we have, for instance, a Web site that is addressed with that particular string. But we have no clue on what the -- whoever is applying for a domain name that has some geographic connotation is going to use with that string. It may be perfectly legitimate or acceptable, and it can be absolutely unacceptable. But we are unable to make this sort of distinction the moment that the string is assigned.

On the other hand, we cannot imagine a sort of a police that does preventive action on this. Maybe -- maybe the UDRP is the only solution to this and to see what is going to happen with that Web site or the other use of the name and to see if it's legitimate or not.

But to have this prior decision, I think it's very difficult to make. So we are going to every -- every different party that is making this discussion is going to make assumption on how the string is going to be used. And, therefore, we are talking sometimes

about completely different things. And it is not -- not reasonable.

On the other hand, we need to have a common rule. So my personal opinion is let's get as fast as possible to a common rule that everybody will have to follow so that there's no misinterpretation. And whether the rule at the end is going to be more or less fair, it becomes, by and large, irrelevant because then people will adopt to that rule. But important thing is not to leave the applicants in the uncertainty. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. We will go back to Number 4 and then back to you Number 2, Annebeth.

JEFF NEUMAN: This is Jeff Neuman. I just wanted to -- I'm one of the co-chairs of the subsequent procedures working group. I don't want to offer my opinion on this subject, but I just -- I came up when I heard one of the latest speakers say that what's in the applicant guidebook was subject to the last PDP, and that's actually not correct.

The -- What's in the guidebook now on geographic names came out of a compromise that was from -- between the GAC and the ICANN board that came out of discussions in 2010, I believe, in

Brussels, when there were consultations that were held. The -- actually, what came out of the GNSO was at the top level there should be no protection of geographic names from the policy development process, and that was not -- there were no reserved strings.

So I just didn't want to leave the -- the perception that this came out -- the current rule came out of a PDP. I'm not saying whether I agree or disagree, but I just want it clear that what's in the guidebook actually came out of a compromise between the ICANN board and the GAC, out of those discussions in 2010, which I believe were in Brussels I think was the -- the intersessional meeting. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That you, Jeff.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Did it in some way -- I mean, I think it would be very useful to hear if that in some way was insufficient or it let us down in the current round because clearly this is about how we go forward and were there shortcomings with that and is there -- you know,

what are the weaknesses and why is there other work going on if this is sufficient?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And while you're thinking about -- Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the record -- the response to Jonathan's question, we must let Annebeth respond to a specific question from Peter, so...

ANNEBETH LANGE: Annebeth Lange again.

Well, both to Peter and actually also to Jeff, I agree, Peter, that it's ended up in an applicant guidebook after a lot of discussion but it started with a PDP, and at that time we were not as good as we are now to cooperate in the beginning.

So when we got the first edition, a lot of people, a lot of stakeholders found things there that they couldn't agree on, so it was much more discussion than -- that it had to be.

So then it -- in my view, it still ended up as a compromise from non-protection at all to some protection but less than the GAC wanted in the first place, so it was in between.

And then you asked why is it three different groups working with this now, if it's sufficient with the PDP, and I think it all started with what Jeff just said, that it was -- the compromise was only

for the first round, so GAC achieved this protection for the first round and it was then an understanding that it should be worked on this further on, so that was why the study group started first, and when they gave the final report, it was established a cross-community working group to try to find, and that was only for first-level country and territory names from ISO 3166, what's in 2.2.4 today.

And then the GAC started to discuss other geographical names because they were not satisfied with the protection that had been given, because it was not protected at all in the guidebook that we have today.

So in my personal view, I think that that is a step too far the other way because it's very difficult to protect everything in geographical -- geographical names.

Where should we draw the line?

But on the other hand, we have some kind of compromise that protects some of the top of the hierarchy that can be a way between, in a way.

But then we have to give some better solution for other geographical names through a dispute resolution, consultation period, other models, to find a way to make it sufficiently safe

for the government that it's not go- -- we don't have the problem that we had other geographical names last round. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I can take 4 before I go back to 5, and then you might want to draw out your question again.

ALEXANDER SCHUBERT: Hello. My name is Alexander Schubert. I am a cofounder of a geo TLD. It was .BERLIN. We started with that in 2005. And there was a similar discussion back then and it was hard to convince everyone that we could even apply for .BERLIN.

So I wanted to support Jeff and I want to read just one sentence from the applicant guidebook.

It says, "Applications for strings that are country or territory names will not be approved as they are not available under the new gTLD program in this applicant round." And it says specifically "in this applicant round."

So it kind of leads to the question: Doesn't that imply that a change was anticipated back then?

So when we say we shouldn't lose the history of the applicant guidebook, that is the history. It says "in this round."

And the other short thing that I wanted to say, whatever will be decided, I would assume in the end if someone goes for a city name, country name, or the like, there will be government approval -- or there should be government approval, in fact -- and that is quite some protection.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Peter?

PETER VERGOTE: Okay. Thank you. I just want -- having heard the latest interventions, I just would like to reverse our thinking patterns a bit.

As I see it, we have been approaching it from the angle what has been going on in the past, what is currently going on, and what would we need to go further.

Now, the latest speakers have clearly indicated that there could be one major obstacle that we are facing. We want to avoid legal uncertainty for applicants in future gTLD rounds.

Now, is it feasible, according to you, to use that as a leverage to do some back-planning?

That might give us a realistic view how wide the timespan is to either continue with what we're doing now, either to say, "Okay,

within this time frame we are not going to get it," or to say, "Well, it's time to drastically change. Let's start with something that could be the current wording in the applicant guidebook concerning the use of country and geographic names and let's take it from there."

I would like to hear from you: Would that be an interesting way to look at things, to do it from -- from a back-planning side?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Peter. And while we're talking -- while you're working out what you're going to say to that, Number 2.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Let us take a realistic, pragmatic, and efficient approach. It is a great mistake if we throw away whatever we have done during the years and years and years. I don't think that any strategy in the world say that start a revolutionary actions and put away everything and start from zero and come back to the same point.

So what we have to do, disband all these parallel working groups, number one. Establish a new working group with involvement of everybody, a multistakeholder approach like CCWG and so on and so forth. Three, take the guidebook as a starting point, identify areas of problems, difficulties,

shortcomings, et patati et patata. Take all the activities has been done by different groups up to now as background information and supporting material and use them, if necessary and appropriate, and then try to have a draft and work on that.

I am sure that we arrive at some degree of harmonization but not absolute harmonization. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you very much. So that's a really interesting point. I mean, the first -- the first sort of assertion is that we disband current activity. The second is that we come together under some form of new umbrella to do this.

Now, I would pose, a counterquestion to that is: In a sense, as others have talked about, this is gTLD policy. gTLD policy comes through the GNSO, with participation from whoever else might like to participate in.

So the question is: Why should this not be done as gTLD policy, and to the extent that there is already gTLD policy going on, is this being dealt with under the new gTLD subsequent procedures work or some other form of gTLD policy?

So let's hear -- because Kavouss makes an interesting suggestion. First of all, throw out the existing parallel work because they clearly are going in parallel and potentially in

conflict. Second, come together under some framework. He posited that we go with a cross-community working group. That's reasonable in one sense, because it's constructive and it's holistic and it goes forward. But we are dealing with new gTLD policy here, so that causes us an issue. Thoughts or responses to that, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And we have two people for Microphone 2 and then we'll be going to Number 4.

ANDERS HEKTOR: Okay. My name is Anders Hektor. I'm the Swedish representative for Sweden.

I'm tempted to ask, "What do you have in mind," but I won't do that.

But it's -- you're asking us to throw away the silos that we're working with to embark on something that we're not familiar with and that we don't know what it would be.

Speaking only for the GAC, we need to have some certainty within our community before starting to engage with other communities. We need to know what we can agree on in the

GAC, so we sort of need this activity, this parallel activity that we have.

Is it possible to put that question on hold if -- whether or not we can drop the parallel activities and talk about what alternative there would be? Because you're asking us to leave what we have and think about what could be, so perhaps we can turn it around. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: That's interesting and useful. So my understanding is that the alternatives would be either GNSO policy development or cross-community working group work. Those seem to be two reasonable alternatives on the table which may or may not be sufficient.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Number 2 and then Number 4.

THOMAS De HAAN: Yes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

THOMAS De HAAN: Oh, sorry. Thomas De Haan, for the record, from the Dutch GAC rep. Just a couple of comments.

I just wanted to say something about what Peter said about back-planning. I think this is quite dangerous because it puts everybody in a kind of time limit and I think this is important enough to deal with before you even launch a second round, but that's my remark on Peter.

The other point is about how this work could be, let's say, carried out in a PDP. I think that the CCWG experience demonstrates that we can work out things which affect many, many stakeholders in ICANN within a cross-community working setting, so I think that would be --

And I think the third thing is that I would just come back to Roberto Gaetano's remark that we should also very much, let's say, incorporate the notion that a UDRP on these kind of things could also be worked out in parallel. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Number 4.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman again, and this is not -- I'm just offering this as my own opinion, but I do think that this would fit in within the GNSO PDP on subsequent procedures.

I also think that -- just to let everyone know, the procedures that we've adopted as far as how the group operates is very much modeled after the CCWG, so that should give some comfort that it is allowing groups to provide input and we very much follow the good work that the CCWG has done.

And I also think that, you know, one of the dangers of the proposal that was mentioned, not by the last speaker but by the speaker before that, was that if you form your own group within the GAC and you form your position, and only then go into the -- either a cross-community group or the PDP, the problem with that is you become too entrenched in your own position and you spend all of your time advocating for your own position rather than coming into a group and allowing yourself to have your position changed due to the conversations and discussions and it becomes harder to compromise or come up with a consensus-based solution.

So I do think it's -- that the work should go on now and the work -- and I would not be in favor, necessarily, of having each group determine what its position is beforehand and then going in,

because then it just becomes a -- to use a -- it becomes almost a boxing match, and that's not what we want.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: What I'm hearing is a sort of sense of feasibility, but three possible mechanisms are being talked about here.

One is integration within a GNSO PDP; one is a proposal that there could be a CCWG to deal with this; and one is to let the GAC do its work before either of those other two and sort of complete it.

That's what I think I'm hearing. If you would like to speak to either of those, by all means, do. If you think I've got it wrong, let me know. But there are some hands up and some microphones.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We have quite a list happening. I have two in Number -- wait. I have a Number 2, a Number 2, a Number 4, and a Number 3.

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Yes. Thank you. Shall I stand up?

This is Young-Eum Lee from .KR. I would actually like to express my support for what Annebeth has said before with regard to trying -- I mean, starting with what we have.

My previous experience with -- and I mean, I'm sure most of you have experienced this -- with the first round as well as the recent work on the cross-community working group on the names of countries and territories, first a study group and then the working group, tells -- I mean shows that there is a very sharp distinction between the opinions of the CCs and the GAC and the opinions of the Gs.

And in a way, I do agree that having the GNSO start their PDP is -- does make sense because I guess the GNSO is more -- more -- we'll have more energy in doing that and will move it up much -- move it forward much faster.

But then, because of the sharp differences, I don't think that just going with the GNSO PDP is -- is the -- is something that the CCs and the GAC could agree on, and so I mean I -- I mean, my opinion is that there should be a -- some kind of cross-community working group of all the -- I mean, all the SOs and ACs and -- or the related parties in a multistakeholder style.

And although Jeff has said that the GNSO working group is a very multistakeholder start, but it will -- I don't think it will be able to incorporate the very sharp differences in opinion of the CCs and the GAC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We have another Number 2 now. Then we go to 4. Then we come back to 3.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. I think we have an experience, a good experience and a bitter experience. CCWG, we know how it's run. 80% of the GNSO. 80%. We don't want to be dominated by a particular group. Let us work together under the name CCWG with a balance, to the extent possible, participation and remove any sensitivity of any group.

You could put all your energies in that group. Nothing prevent you.

So let us take something which is more practicable and does not create any difficulty at all.

Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And we are going to number 4 and it's going to be two speakers, the second one very short, isn't it, Jeff, and then I'm coming over here for number 3.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, just to -- this is Jeff Neuman. Just to quickly respond. Again, I'm not saying whether I prefer CCWG or a PDP, but again,

a PDP is meant to be -- involve the entire community. I can't help the perception that -- that is in this room, but it is not dominated by the G's. It is a fully inclusive group. There's a lot of individuals in there as well. I just want to say that I do believe a PDP can operate in the same way a CWG would be, a cross working group.

So I want to make that very clear that we should not just throw it out. The ALAC has been participating in the GNSO PDP since the beginning, and I don't think you'd find too many ALAC participants complain and say that they don't feel like their input has been heard.

So -- And Cheryl might be able to comment on that. So I do think the GNSO PDP.

And also, the last point I want to make is that to say that, especially to the extent we talk about the second level, right, because there's a difference between the top level and the second level, and I know I'm grouping them right now together at this point. To say that the second level is a CC issue where the CC should be involved may or may not be accepted by everyone in the community.

So I just want to point that out, that a lot of gTLDs -- again, just putting on my neutral hat -- a lot of the gTLDs view this,

especially at the second level, as a gTLD issue as opposed to a ccTLD issue.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Jeff.

Let's stick to 4 briefly, then I've got to come back to number 3.

CONSTANTINE ROUSSOS: Yeah, hi. This Constantine Roussos from .MUSIC.

I wanted to agree with Iran, and a lot of others who have said it's very difficult to develop a harmonized framework just because every country is different and you have to look at some issues, geopolitical issues. And also, when it comes to country and geographic names, it's true that the -- those constituents within those groups, GAC, government, should be involved.

I'll give an extreme example. Let's say there was a policy to allow someone to apply for a country gTLD. Let's say .CYPRESS, for example. Someone from Turkey applies for .CYPRESS, then you've got these political issues.

Another example is let's say someone applies. You don't know who they are. There's a case with .BLOG. Word Press applied for it and no one knew it was Word Press.

So we've got to look at a lot of these issues in how the first round went. And I do believe if you're talking about country codes and geographic names, these countries should vet who is applying for it and have some involvement. And the process should be simple and not complex.

Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I didn't hear Iran saying -- talking against a harmonized framework. I heard, I think, on the contrary; some suggestions that we disband the parallel activities. And the issue is under what mechanism we might develop it and that's what I was hearing. Is it PDP, is it let GAC do its own work, or is it under a CCWG type mechanism?

So just to clarify. If there is a misunderstanding, come back, Kavouss, or anyone else. But that's what I'd heard. It wasn't so much that it couldn't be a harmonized framework.

Let's let the conversation carry on, then.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So we're going 3, 1, and then 4.

NICK:

Hello there. My name is Nick. I am from the U.K. government. I'm a relative GAC baby. I've only been here for just about a year, so I'm still learning my way through this organization, and I'm finding out the history of these geographical name issues.

This discussion of sort of maybe -- sort of developing a single process to address this seems interesting to me personally.

I'm just wondering. So I've seen some of the -- the tail end of the work that's gone on in the CCWG around the accountability for the transition, and I've seen the very tail end of the privacy/proxy issue where recommendations went to the board and there was GAC advice that didn't ultimately make it into the recommendations.

Could I just ask -- Jonathan, you might be able to answer this -- what's the difference between the end of the PDP process and the end of a CCWG process where the decision is taken around, you know, sort of what the final position is going to be that goes to the Board?

So as far as I understand, in sort of the PDP process, you have an initial report, goes out to public comment, refined, and then there's some decision taken. I don't know what that is.

Would you be able to explain what that is and how that compares to a CCWG process?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I'll try. I suspect there are others more expert than me on this in the room.

It struck me earlier, we talk about, in terms of the bias of a GNSO PDP process, in a sense, we in some ways incorrect in calling it a GNSO PDP process because really what it is is a PDP process applied to gTLDs. And the PDP process is meant to be inclusive. And by calling it a GNSO PDP process, we give the impression that it's for the GNSO, whereas really it's been developing policy as it pertains to gTLDs.

The GNSO PDP process, as we call it, that PDP process generates a policy which is given to the Board under a framework governed by the bylaws and under which the Board has to respond in certain predetermined ways. And providing due process is followed, it essentially has to accept it or have good reason to reject it. There's very specific criteria.

The whole CCWG framework is a relatively new and developing framework that doesn't result in, frankly, any particular outcome. The Board could throw it in the rubbish bin in some sense. It's clearly, in terms of its accountability to the community, if the Board is satisfied that due process has been followed, it would not be sensible for it to just throw it in the bin, but the PDP process as it pertains to gTLD policy is very clearly

governed within the ICANN bylaws and process, which is much less so with CCWG. But nevertheless, we -- with the work we've done on CCWGs recently, especially as we've begun to really polish up the processes and the understanding and start to develop a common view of other work, they're becoming much more significant.

But that was why I made my point earlier where there was a concern of applying CCWG processes to GNSO policy, because they are quite, quite different.

So I hope that's helpful, Nick, and I hope that it's accurate. If anyone --

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: A small right of reply. Very short, please.

NICK: No, thank you. Sorry. Just a follow-up. So at the end of kind of the CCWG process for the transition, we had the sort of situation where the chartering organizations had to say yea or nay to that thing, and then it was passed to the Board.

What is -- always the final step in the GNSO PDP? I think that was my question.

Is it -- Is it like a meeting where there's a vote? Because I can imagine a concern for governments might be that kind of that stage, you know, if there's a government position, is it just taken as one vote and then, you know, equal to everyone else? And the governments might think, we're not --

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Two different points there, Nick. First of all, on the CCWG Accountability, as I understand, the Board made a unique commitment, a one-off commitment to be essentially bound by that, is my understanding. But that doesn't pertain to all future CCWGs.

With respect to the PDP process, the Board may accept or reject that, and it is also subject to GAC advice, for which there are unique.

So the GAC can ultimately come in, and in a sense structurally. That's a problem we've been grappling with for a while. And in one way, that's what we're trying to deal with now, because GAC advice coming in late in the day or essentially having a disruptive effect on that final outcome, which the system is designed to do and the GAC has never foregone that ability, but nevertheless, it is desirable from the sort of effectiveness of the process overall that GAC is involved earlier and more thoroughly in the process.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Now, just a punctuation point. We're going to run the conversation for only another ten minutes because we want five minutes for wrap-up and we will be finishing on time.

So I'm going to ask all of you to make your interventions as short as practical. And we're now going to number 1.

GEMA CAMPILLOS: Hello. This is Gema Campillos, GAC representative from Spain.

I'm going to be brief, but I would like to speak in Spanish, if that's possible.

With respect to the question, I prefer to deal with it in a cross-constituency working group because I think this is kind of symbolic. Even though policy may make reference to generic names, the purpose of it relies on something that we, government representatives, feel that is very close to us and is country codes and country names.

So as you have said, you are citizens of your own country so you should consider it that way, too. Quite sensitive for you, too.

So we feel more comfortable. And I think that I myself feel more comfortable if all of us can work in the same environment on an

equal foot, and not within a process that is led by one organization.

So first of all, it would be a symbolic measure.

Secondly, on a legal basis, if the cross-constituency working groups continue being held as they have been, at the very end there should be a consensus within that cross-constituency working group, and all of the organizations should rely on the decisions made by that cross-constituency working group. While the policies of the GNSO, if I am not mistaken, those that are entitled to vote are the members of GNSO.

So I think that it would be more balanced and it would be more in agreement with the principle of adopting consensus-based policies in ICANN.

And thirdly, there's a practical reason. If the process is developed at the GNSO, there will be a GAC advice at the very end. And so perhaps there may be a decision that is not the one that the GNSO would have liked. Why? Because we governments do not have the resources to have a PDP that is (indiscernible) of GNSO, with mailing list of 150 emails a day, of teleconferences once a week. So I think it's better if we go to a cross-constituency working group.

Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Number 4. I will then come back to number 3, and -- sorry. I've got number 2. 2 with number 4, and 3 is the end before the moderators do their bit.

ANDERS HEKTOR: Thank you. Anders Hektor again, Sweden, member of the GAC, although not speaking for the GAC, obviously. Just speaking for Sweden at this time as well as before.

I don't want to give the impression that I think the GAC should do its work first and then tell everybody else what it came up to. That's not the point. On the contrary, I think the CCWG, as Iran said, had both a sweet and sour aftertaste.

It's a good model. It's a neutral ground, so to speak. But it's also a concern that governments sometimes had difficulties in making their voices heard. That's at least the way many countries feel. So it could be an interesting model to start with. But the terms of reference would, of course, be a very delicate issue to decide on first. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I have -- I saw at least two speakers from number 4. Go ahead.

GREG SHATAN:

Hi, Greg Shatan with McCarter & English and the Intellectual Property Constituency. I think that it's, you know, obviously very valuable to talk about what might be. But we need to consider what is and what is the actual constitutional framework of ICANN under the bylaws that we operate with, which is that the policies for gTLDs are managed by the GNSO. So the term "GNSO PDP" is -- as being identified with the members of the GNSO is really a misnomer, as is the term "cross-community working group." The GNSO PDP working groups are, in fact, cross-community. They're intended to involve all who wish to participate. There is no favor given to those who are members of the GNSO versus any other participant. They work by consensus of those who participate, no matter where you came from. As long as you're a human from the planet earth. That seems to be the only gating factor. Apologies if anybody does not fit. So that is where GNSO policy is made and developed.

Cross-community working groups are not policy development groups. The CCWG and the CWG are anomalies that were established under certain circumstances due to a very specific request that was made of ICANN. And that should not be setting a precedent that somehow GNSO policy -- or rather I should say gTLD policy is made anywhere else but a GNSO PDP. So that is

not to say that the constitutional framework that we have is perfect. As we've seen following it to the letter, we end up with the GAC involved too late and coming in kind of like a second architect into a house who decides that they don't like where the walls are and they don't like where the windows are, and that's never a very good setup. So we need to rethink that. And I think that early involvement of the GAC members in the GNSO managed PDPs to developed gTLD policy is the way things should work because that is the way things are set out to work. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sticking with 4.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade. While I am from the business community and my official home at ICANN is at the business constituency, I'm not speaking as a business constituency but as somebody who was here before ICANN existed and who actually paid the lawyer who wrote the bylaws for the GNSO, then called the DNSO. I want to be sure Greg is able to listen to what I have to say. I am hearing a really interesting point being made by several members of the GAC. I also helped design the PDP process when I was a councilor on the GNSO. I work, as many of you from government know,

beside you or a colleague of yours in many of the U.N. organizations where different processes exist for developing policy.

Here at ICANN what I have seen in the last year and a half is a great evolution to a more open interaction between all of the different formerly vertical parts of ICANN into a more horizontal collaborative model in the cross-community working groups. It's not perfect just as the PDP process within the GNSO and to be quite frank, let's be clear, it is the GNSO's PDP process. Even if it includes other people. I am hearing a concern being expressed that there may be a view that another process might be a little more equalized in the beginning. I think the most important thing is to reach an agreement on working on this issue and working on it together. And I think rather than saying that the cross-community working group was a one-off approach at the invitation of someone to solve a problem, we, as the cross-communities, ought to look hard at the cross-community working group process and see if it can help us work together in this area.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Marilyn. I have number 3, and I had closed the queue with number 3. This is the last speaker from the floor. We are

now wrapping up after that with our two moderators. Over to you, number 3.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I'm Alan Greenberg from ALAC. I'm one of the people that Jeff referred to as we participated in GNSO PDPs forever. I have put in more hours than I could possibly calculate into that process. I have also put in more hours than I could possibly calculate into CCWGs. It's a good thing I can't calculate them because I'm not sure I could justify it.

There is a -- there are some similarities in both. Both of them are work intensive and you have to put major commitments into it. That's really difficult for people who aren't part of the industry and funded by it. And that's true in both. There is also a difference. Ultimately in the PDP if you can have enough people to get enough voices in the PDP, you may well get heard and listened to. But the decision is ultimately made by the GNSO, in which place the ALAC has a minimal voice and no vote. A CCWG, if we are a chartering organization, it comes back to us and we have to bless the output. That's a really, really big difference. So yes, the two processes have a lot in common. They're not necessarily bad processes, but we do have to recognize what the differences are and how they affect the outcomes. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. And, Peter, if you can do a 90 second on where you're feeling all of this is now, and then we'll go to Jonathan.

PETER VERGOTE: Okay. Thank you, Cheryl. Well, I think that we have covered a lot of ground today. I see -- I won't call it consensus, but I see a lot of support for a solution or a trajectory that says well, let's have either a PDP, either a CCWG to deal with this and to get us forward because also I get the impression that everybody says, well, we should not stop. We should not throw away what we have, and we should not cease with our attempts to come to something that is workable. So I think this is a very positive input that we got from all the participants today.

Now, I would like to end with a bit of a bombshell. And people don't have to answer it, but it's just something to take with you. One of the things that according to me made a success out of the CCWG regarding IANA and regarding the accountability, ICANN's accountability, was time pressure. We knew there was a deadline. It pushed us to our very limits. If we don't have a deadline, regardless whether we will have a PDP or a CCWG and even in the case of a CCWG the urgency of a deadline is even more crucial, I would say, so I think if we continue thinking in that direction, we also certainly should figure out a way how we

can come to a certain result within a certain time frame. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you. So that's a very interesting point, that -- that the use of a deadline to -- artificial or factual to create an outcome. I picked up a number of different things. Firstly, I mean, I heard the talk about the enhanced collaboration that's been going on. I'm not sure -- I think it's been great in the CCWGs. I think it's a very valuable mechanism, and I'm passionate about it and I think we've applied some great techniques and done well. But I've also seen enhanced collaboration, whether it's associated with that or other activities within the PDP work. So I think the spirit of enhanced collaboration crosses both mechanisms. I don't think it's necessarily within one mechanism or another. So we have the opportunity to work effectively and collaboratively in both.

It does worry me a little that from a kind of GNSO perspective, if you like, we are -- we seem to have confused, to some extent, the -- the nature of the outcomes of those two groups because they are different. One is very tightly bound, and as I said, into the ICANN bylaws and processes and one is less so. I'm a passionate advocate of the use of CCWGs. I think it's quite clear that Gema particularly and Alan to some extent highlighted why

CCWGs may be more inclusive or have a political dimension the way they -- where they're more acceptable. So one way or another we need to be cognizant of that. It certainly feels like that's the case. But, you know, the purpose of this session was not to be -- much as an engineer like me likes to produce solutions -- it wasn't necessarily about producing an outcome.

I will say when you look at the poll, it's kind of interesting because when we came into the meeting there were around 25 to 30% of you who thought a harmonized outcome wasn't possible and the rest of you were split actually quite a strong bias towards yes, about 50 and another 25 on maybe and 25 on no. Where we've settled is that a few more of you have moved into the maybe camp from both sides. So in the end we've got around 80% yes or maybe and 20% no. So in a sense that's encouraging. For the balance of you are thinking -- significant balance of you are thinking something's possible. So -- and I think -- I like Peter's bombshell. I don't think it's that controversial. I think having a deadline helps, but it's clear we've got the possibility of a way forward. But I'm not going to try and capture that. Back to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. And what I'd like to do now is just ask you to take a moment to thank most sincerely our moderators

because I think they've done a fabulous job, and you can put your hands together for that purpose.

[Applause]

While you're clapping, continue to clap for the fantastic staff that have managed all of that microphone running around the place.

[Applause]

And I'm afraid they deserve a standing ovation, at least from me, because it's hard to keep up with my Australian, the interpreting team are just brilliant, and we would be nothing without you.

[Applause]

Tech guys, brilliant.

BART BOSWINKLE: May I -- finally, finally, finally may I have a very warm thank you for Cheryl, our chair. She's done very well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This session is now closed.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]