

Heather Dryden:

...welcome the Board to our traditional meeting with the GAC and I hope you appreciated the reserved seating. This way we can keep an eye on you. So what we're proposing to discuss today primarily is the final DAG or DAG 5, and we'd like to raise some process points or timeline concerns in relation to that as well.

We may identify particular issues that we see as outstanding that colleagues around the table would like to raise. And if there's a time perhaps a couple of observations that we would like to bring to your attention in relation to the Accountability and Transparency Review Team work. Yes.

Peter Dengate Thrush:

Thank you, Heather, and thank you very much for the seating. We appreciate it. And we also appreciate the very big turn out, so thank you for all those others coming to participate. We have actually been working on the assumption that the draft agenda would be the major topic. So we really came to talk about payment of fees, GAC advice in relation to operational matters, universal resolvability, and blocking, and the review of strings for breaches of the national laws, and also to talk about possible departures from GAC advice that may be coming on Friday, the triple X decision is up for decision, and possibly later than that the geographic names issues, just to talk about the procedure that we want to adopt for that, but I think that in fairness to the process we're happy to talk about any issues arising out of the guidebook.

---

And if you want to talk about timelines or those things, I'm sure we can fit all of those in, so how would you like it. If you have questions, we'd be happy to receive them.

Heather Dryden: Yes. Thank you. Well, I'd like to call on Denmark first to make an initial comment.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Sorry, could I just interrupt that for a moment by saying that news has reached me of a very important election, and I'd like to be the first to congratulate you Heather on being elected as Chair of the GAC, that's an extraordinary opportunity and a great honor.

Heather Dryden: Thank you.

Peter Dengate Thrush: And the whole Board looks forward to having you stay with us as a liaison and to continue cheering this very important institution. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Denmark please.

Julia Kahan-Czarny: Thank you, it's Julia Kahan from Denmark. We have noted on the ICANN website that the Board might take a decision on DAG 5 on Friday, 10th, which is the same day as the deadline for the public comments for the DAG 5. And that makes it sort of not possible to make an informed decision when - when the dates coincide in this manner. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Did you want to respond to that, or shall we continue?

Peter Dengate Thrush: I think we're aware of the issue. Thank you very much.

Heather Dryden: New Zealand.

Paul Alexander: Yes, I just - it is really a similar point I think that we have been quite distressed, I think as both individually, as people have needed to consult with our governments, and within the GAC as a whole, that the very, very late arrival of key important documents for these meetings.

It seems to be more a matter of habit than exception these days, I'm thinking of for example the latest report on economic implications, but routinely the documents are arriving within the last week or so, we don't have time to consider them, I'm sure the Board doesn't have time to consider them appropriately either. As a working method for the ICANN system, it seems to be something that needs fixing.

Frank March: Thank you and if I can just comment. As an example of the economic study, I mean we shared it as soon as it was finished. And I mean it's a independent study by the economists, and we had hoped it might have come a bit earlier, but we shared it as soon as it was available and posted it for public comment, and very much appreciate your comments, and as I am sure you can also appreciate, it's just a very large research load on different things and the policy documents, and processes. But point taken and thank you for sharing that.

Heather Dryden: If I may, I think the point is that the GAC was expecting the economic study to be published before a decision was made regarding vertical integration, and that's really the point of New Zealand's comment.

Frank March: I'll have to go back and check the exact documents. I believe the vertical integration document economic study was posted some time ago. The study that was just posted pertains to the new detail D program and to new generic top level domains.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Frank, I've just checked with staff, because that's a matter of a bit concern, and we created this policy of a blackout, so that there would be a period prior to the meetings and I'm informed by my staff that other than the strategic plan, which is not being considered at this meeting, no documents other than the economic study have been - have breached the black out period. And so that's been true for the three or four meetings.

So in general we think we're complying with the proposal that we set up because we have the same problem that you do, that we do not want papers coming in and we can all remember the bad old days when for a variety of reasons, they did, so I think - and feel free to challenge that if you can, but the information from staff is that other than the economics report which was outside of our hands, it wasn't - it came in from outside as it were, that we have in fact been meeting the principle that documents that are going to be considered at a meeting and not published you know inside that

three weeks. You know the DAG itself was published some time ago, and well outside the black out period.

Paul Alexander: If I can just expand my comments. The guidebook was actually published earlier than ever before this meeting, and it was our understanding that the GAC committed to responding 15 days in advance of this meeting. And I'm not sure whether that date was met or not.

Heather Dryden: Sweden please.

Maria Häll: Thank you very much, Heather, and this Maria from Sweden. And it's very good to see you all again here at the ICANN Board. I would like to start by saying that I am actually here in Cartagena. I was in Brussels. I was in Nairobi and I was also in Seoul, because of the fact on behalf of the Swedish government that we support the ICANN model. And both me and many, several of my governmental colleagues also spent actually hours and days in Cartagena - in Guadalajara in Mexico at the ICANN Potentiary meeting, defending this model.

That took a lot of energy, but it was very important, and we were very happy actually with the result, which means that actually ICANN is mentioned in this ITU policy document. So that is very, very important, I think to have in mind. I mean we like you, and we like to support you, and well that's actually why we're here.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Thank you, we appreciate that.

Maria Häll:

Okay. So but having said that, so here come - here it comes. I think that's a good way to start, you know, be the cause of their things, then I can be a little bit rude. I'm not going to rude. But I'm going to let my colleagues to be rude instead. Anyway, I just want to say that we have some - some concerns, of course and those concerns are very important to see that they're going to be resolved because of supporting the model and trying to - to make progress in the future.

So I mean if for instance this discussion about GAC advice, I mean it feels a little bit ridiculous coming to all this meeting, traveling around the World to all these nice places, and then suddenly end up in a discussion whether this is advice or not, that's really putting poor, but that is a little bit crazy I think.

And it's also embarrassing to have that discussion with my Minister, and she's not going to appreciate that. But I think that all these kind of things that go into (inaudible 0:08:57) are sold, but try to have this, as I told in the beginning in the background, when we had the discussion, and I give the floor to my colleagues and to Heather. Thank you.

Heather Dryden:

Thank you, Sweden. European Commission.

William Dee:

Thank you, yes. I hesitate following Sweden when she suggested other colleagues are going to be rude to you, because you might get the wrong impression. I was asked, and you'll be pleased to

know that we've really prioritized this issue of this meeting. We've had lots of discussions already, they haven't actually finished, I think we're due to continue tomorrow, and then we'll draft the communiqué. But I was asked by colleagues actually to give you a general overview of some of the - if I can call them high-level issues actually that we have - concerns that we have about the process.

The first issue I think we want to emphasize, particularly for members of the Board who may be recent arrivals, is that the GAC has been giving advice on ugTLDs for an awful long time. Our first substantive primary advice which we refer to as the GAC principals on ugTLDs were adopted and given to the Board in March 2007. I think that was before the policy on ugTLDs was actually adopted by the Board.

Since that time the GAC has continued to engage regularly with the Board, the GNSO, ICANN staff to explain its concerns regarding the PDP and the implementation proposals set out in the various and consecutive versions of the DAG.

In addition, we've continued to give advice in the form of communiqués. I think every communiqué since then actually we've provided a chapter on new gTLDs. I managed to find 11 letters from the GAC that we've sent. I have to say that you know the main reason we've had to do this is to repeat the advice we gave in the principles, if you go back to the principles, our advice

actually is very consistent with that set of documents. So we've been giving advice for a long time.

And you know the GAC appreciates very much the efforts made by many in the ICANN community to understand and accommodate the advice of the GAC during that period. But we remain concerned that many of the original public policy issues that we raised remain unresolved in the latest version of the DAG. And that may well be actually we think on reflection, a problem caused - a process problem caused by the fact that when the Board adopted the policy from the GNSO, at that point in time there were already differences between the policy proposed and the gTLD principles. And this is something we - had been recognized and discussed with the GNSO at that time.

But that seems to be the root of the problem. That's why it's been difficult to resolve those two positions since then. Moreover, the most recent letter, the 23rd of November from the Chairman of the Board confirmed that many of the concerns of the GAC remain unresolved. And in addition, that GAC notes that the Board has decided to explicitly reject GAC advice in two specific cases related to the objection process and requirements to governments must pay fees to file objections, and the results of the first phase of the economic study.

In addition, the GAC - not in addition, I should say actually in parallel it's an important issue, the GAC is increasingly concerned that gTLD applicants, many of whom have made significant



investments in their business models have a legitimate expectation that the process for introducing new gTLDs should have been concluded by now.

The GAC is also mindful, however, that major stakeholder groups within ICANN, and we saw this in the joint meeting we had this week already with the GNSO, major stakeholder group, such as the business and intellectual property constituencies, do not believe that the most recent version of the DAG reflects their advice and concerns.

And then I have a section of my own notes here, obviously I'm referring to them on individual issues, but my colleagues have already started to raise those with you, and I'm sure we'll go back to them afterwards.

Finally, in view of the Board's determination reflected in the 23rd November letter, the response to the GAC's comments on DAG 4, that it cannot accept certain elements containing GAC advice. The GAC assumes the Board is invoking the provisions in the ICANN by-laws to seek a mutually acceptable resolution of these differences and looks forward to engaging in the discussions foreseen in the by-laws to attempt to resolve situations where the Board has decided to reject GAC advice.

A more generic comment actually that came up in our previous session with the ccNSO, in which colleagues wanted to share with the Board, relates to an issue that Sweden's already raised actually.

And that's the fact that ICANN is a controversial model, you know that, in government terms actually that it's constantly challenged. Many of the GAC members here invest a significant amount of time defending that model and other intergovernmental organizations.

And as taxpayers, you'll be pleased to know that we're under increasing pressure to justify travel and mission expenses to meetings such as this. One justification, or the main justification that we give to our hierarchies and our Ministers for coming here is that we have to help this private sector self-regulatory body, and make sure that it does not cross any public policy red lines, and to develop policies in the general public interest. That's a hard sell when we appear to be traveling at great cost to repeat the same advice. I'll be frank, actually, when you go back through all of these communiqués and you go through all the letters and the minutes of our meetings and the exchanges with yourselves and the Board and ICANN staff and other stakeholders, we're repeating the same advice all the time.

And to rub salt into the wound, if I can use the English expression, it's also difficult to justify to Ministers why we're coming, when the latest development is that we may have to pay to give advice. We have specific problems with gTLDs and we want to tell you we've got a specific problem from a public policy perspective, for example, because there's a country name involved, or a geographic name that raises concerns in our countries. That's a very difficult issue to reconcile with the defense that we have of the model. And

to be frank, there is a growing concern amongst GAC members that the current state of affairs you know is ammunition, for those who want to attack the ICANN model. Because we have to go home, we have to justify why we're traveling to protect, and why we take the positions that we do. And that the current issues in gTLDs in many ways highlight some of the problems this is creating for us back at home.

And finally, a small point, the - I recall from the discussions we had in Brussels, actually, there was a suggestion, I think it was repeated in the letter, that it's not much good if the GAC expressed concerns about things and can't provide any solutions for you to consider. And while I'd actually challenge that on the main basis, that you know I think our view and the view of the Board in the past has been that we're an advisory committee, that the supporting organizations in INCANN define policies, and they're adopted by the Board or rejected by the Board, and if the staff implement them, and the GAC's job is to provide advice. I think that the idea that we shouldn't come to you with concerns unless we've got you know alternative implementation mechanisms suggests you're trying to broaden our arena in some way that I think that we for healthy reasons want to resist. I challenge that.

But that said, I shall give you an example, the objection procedure is one that we discussed before and I notice, Peter, that you want to talk about it today. It seems to us that it's over complicated, the reflections on this we've had so far. And I'll put this to you. We could have a procedure where we see the list of applications that

are made, and when there's a geographic issue at stake and the government raises an objection, you might encourage the applicant and the government concerned to go away and talk about it, and not come back until they have a solution.

Now, you might seem to think that's a radical idea, but I suspect some and certainly some in the ccNSO will recognize that that's existing ICANN policy in cases of Redelegation. It's a policy approach that's been defended by ICANN, it's been accepted by the GAC, but until the government and the registry operator come to - or the prospective registry operator come to an agreement, then ICANN can't become involved. I think there's a solution there for us, based on precedent.

So that's just to try and be very constructive about one specific problem that we have. But I hope you appreciate that these comments from GAC members here today are intended to be constructive, and they were meant in that spirit. Thank you very much.

Christian Singer:

Thank you, Bill, and we take them all as very constructive. I just wonder how useful the debate will be, if we pick up any one of those long list of issues and go into them in any detail now. I mean, I can make the point for example, that I can clearly distinguish between an individual country wanting to take part and being required to use the objection process, and distinguish that from the GAC giving a bias.

Individual - ICANN doesn't take advice from individual governments under the current structure. We take advice from the GAC. So if there is an individual country wishing to make an individual objection to any particular application, it strikes me that that's a very different issue from saying and now GAC members have to pay to give advice. I mean I can distinguish those two. I can see a situation in the objections process, where if the GAC wants to take a position as the GAC and make an objection to a string, can easily make an example that it is doing so for reasons of public - in the public interest, it's an organ of ICANN that there may well be a reason why the GAC shouldn't have to pay an objection fee, because that's a different issue.

So I just wonder whether you know we could take each one of those points that you've raised, and you know my last substantive response was 24 pages, because you know, as you say, you keep giving advice and we keep, obviously also responding to it. It's not that there's a silence from our part. So I just wonder how we can make this productive sort of exchange today without going into the really deep detail and relation even perhaps to the wording of some of the things which is perhaps is what we have to do. Perhaps we all have to get together and have a half day or a day session together and work through these things. But Bruce had a --

Bruce Tonkin:

Well, I guess I have a question, perhaps some sort of suggestion, but the question of you Bill, you said that the original principles of the gTLDs, which as you know I was involved in the very early days when they were developed, and certainly the GNSO at the

time, tried to take most of those into account. Can you be specific at what you think the remaining ones are? The ones that I'm aware of was geographic. Is there anything else on the list, just going - because I think you're right, I think if you haven't got agreement on the principles then it's hard to start getting agreement on the implementation. So what specifically, other than geographic names, which I believe we are going to meet with you this week to discuss in more detail, what else was in that principles where you think were divergent?

William Dee:

Well, I don't want this to turn into a monologue actually. But my answer would be, I'd refer you to the letters and the communications that we've been sending for the last three or four years; because all of those issues were covered in the principles. They're all there actually, and then they're repeated again, and again, and again. And I don't think we can - if we start listing them now --

Bruce Tonkin:

Okay, so you're saying it's a long list then.

William Dee:

That's a long list, yes.

Bruce Tonkin:

Yes, okay.

William Dee:

Yes, and I think that's one of the impressions I had from the discussions that we've had here and I stand corrected by colleagues, but they asked me to speak to this point, because we

---

prepared a summary already of our working group discussions. And that's basically what I'm reading.

Bruce Tonkin:

Yes. Because I think the perception of the Board is that we're converging and that we're working through the issues, but your - you have, it sounds like, an entirely different opinion which is that we're - we still have wide gaps, so you know - so then my suggestion which is what Peter was referring to is how do we move forward?

I don't think these one-hour meetings are working, because I hear you say the same thing pretty much every meeting. And that seems that we're not making good use of this time. And maybe what we should be doing, I mean I'd be in favor of two solid days together instead of you guys meeting in the room and us meeting in another room, maybe we should just be working through and make sure, firstly make sure we understand the issues that you're raising, and secondly us try and articulate how we think we're dealing with those issues.

Maybe we're wrong. But in many cases we think, taking geographics, we think we've move substantially from where we were two or three years ago on that topic to where we are today, and speaking personally, I didn't think the gap's that big. I thought we could close that gap this meeting. But to close that gap requires actually getting in the room and talking it through.

Heather Dryden: Thank you, Bruce. I think Rod has a quick comment and then Germany.

Rod Beckstrom: And just to get back quickly to Frank and your good comment on the mountains of documents that come out of ICANN, just check the records, the commitment to the GAC was to pose I think documents, such as the guidebook, 15 working days before the start of the public meeting. This guidebook was published 16 days beforehand, or 24 calendar days and our understanding of the GAC's position was that they had that much advance time; they could share opinions and views at the meeting.

I still want to just acknowledge the huge amount of work that the GAC does and the mountains of paper that heads your way. And also that you know there are a number of cases, certainly in the guidebook, where your advice has changed positions from what might have been approved, for example by the GNSO.

Heather Dryden: Thank you, Rod. Germany please.

Hubert Schoettner: Yes, just an observation in respect of the timelines. Yes, we appreciate that the fifteen days has been used and accepted. But you have to say the applicant guidebook is 400 pages, and it's not user paper - you have for discussion, it's a paper you really have to analyze and I think in this case you have - probably have to have other yes, measures to check this.



I want to come back to the question of geographic names, because there was a question. And I just want to come back first with - to the position, Bill was already mentioning, yes, the question of how to protect geographic names was mentioned already in our GAC principles and that's almost four years ago. We mentioned and highlighted, it says ICANN should avoid country, territory, places, name and country territorial regional language, or people description, unless in agreement with the relevant government or public authority. And that is a guiding principle. I think that still stands for the GAC, and I hope also for the community.

And we had - we working quite a lot of involved and tried yes, in a positive way to follow this discussion, and the first idea I recall was to have a list, and how this list can be extended, and what kind of name can be on this list, and then we came to the conclusion okay, maybe a list is - can never be exhausted, because there may some understanding for geographic names that is not - is different and may not be on the list and on the other hand, even the geographic name may be used as brand or whatever, and in this context, if there are clear safeguards.

I think nobody would object with the exception of really certain very important geographic names. And I think insofar the concept as it is, is something we can agree, we have the country territory names, we have the city names, we have national divisions. This is okay. You know in general we have also UNESCO regions that also examples we will think these are blocked, nobody else but with governmental support, nobody can use them. Other names

are not blocked for government, but if they are - if they are geographic things, say there should be certain safeguards that they are not used for - as geographic names. And that is exactly what my understanding would be. And if we have this understanding, then it is important, that we have an adequate process for objecting.

It is part of the first of all it's a question of the fees that has already been discussed, because I just want to recall that this - we are not talking on this - the costs for the objection fees, it is a question if there is - if some applicant has applied, delivered his application formally, and somebody from outside is filing an objection, then there is normally no way for the applicant not to respond. Therefore, he will respond, and then we'll end in a litigation, in a panel review, and then it depends on the decision there will be somebody who has to pay the price. In some cases, probably it will also be the geographic region that has to - or government that has to pay that. And then we are speaking on sums of money which are significantly higher than the normal objection fees, that is just for recalling.

And then if I come to the process itself, I think some of the criteria for the panel has to check or decide on are not reflecting the needs of the government, for example, I wonder how could a government explain or object not knowing what an applicant would do with his top level domains, and say this is causing damage to me. I don't know how this will - how he should do that.

---

The second question, I don't even know whether he - government can say we are targeted community, because maybe some (inaudible 0:28:42) owner will use it for really internal purposes, but nobody will know it from the outside. And that is we are in a really legalistic situation and tricky situation, where I do not know how we can solve it. I think it's rather, yes, conflict orientated situation and not consent oriented situation. And that is something we would be very like and encourage the Board to improve. Thank you.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Could you just clarify, I didn't quite understand the first question. I agree - that's to say that I agree with much of your resuscitation of how we've moved from those principles to the position that you described, in terms of what's now protected. So I was with you all way until you started asking first question, if you could just help me, I didn't quite understand what the first question was.

Hubert Schoettner: What first question?

Peter Dengate Thrush: Well, you said you had two questions, and you ended with two questions, and I didn't really hear what the question in the - well, if there wasn't a question, that's fine, that means it's my fault.

Hubert Schoettner: Yes, there was - yes, there were two problems. One problem was the process itself, that you have to pay an objection fee and it is a rather conflicting process. And the second one is the criteria in the decision making - or the decision making of the panel, they do not meet governmental yes requirements.

[background conversation]

Peter Dengate Thrush: Yes, we thought we're going to have a separate session on geographic names at some stage, so we might get into detail. Well, I've actually asked - I don't know whether we're up to - John are you able to put up the paper? Is there somebody with access to one of these screens, or have they been switched off?

So, while we're waiting, can we first move off geographic onto another question.

Heather Dryden: Italy please.

Stefano Trumpy: Okay. Magic word, advice. Something immaterial. The Accountability and Transparency Review Team is doing a great work in order to try to elaborate about the interaction of the GAC with the Board. So I want to stress this point. The story is that GAC is requested by the Board for an advice. And then the GAC issue the advice to the Board. The real point is that perhaps there is not post advise interpretation, let's say.

The Board should interact soon after - sooner as possible with the GAC, in order to understand where are implementation problems. If the advice is really understood in all this facets because often the GAC that is working for consensus, the expressions are quite general, let's say. So this is something that is missing in my opinion. Because what happens, happens that the Board instruct

the staff to verify the implementability, blah, blah, blah, then the GAC in some cases knows of problems from the staff, and none from the Board. And the relation is exactly GAC with Board. And then ICANN is taking decisions on issues and in the end the GAC interpret that the advice has been rejected.

So and this is why we didn't have an explanation before, and I think you don't like that GAC says that an advice has been rejected, and you think that you behaved not in such a way. So we need a more quick interaction just after the advice has been issued.

Heather Dryden:

If I may, thank you Stefano. I think it's fair to say that from a GAC point of view, there really is a lot of interest in clarifying and ensuring that on both sides it's clear how advice is being processed - GAC advice is being processed by staff versus Board, and how they are communicating this data is clearly of that advice, whether it's been accepted or rejected and providing the rationale for those decisions.

On a more positive note, there was a letter recently in response to our comments on DAG 4, and in that letter there was at least a clear indication there on two issues that the Board has rejected GAC advice. And so that at least brought clarity to that issue.

I believe Kenya would like to make a comment that's perhaps a bit more broad regarding all the inputs, including GAC advice that is received by the Board. Kenya?

Alice Munyua:

Thank you very much, Heather. Mine is just to - to begin with to appreciate all the efforts that the entire ICANN community you know continues to make towards accommodating GAC advice, however, as you've heard from many of my colleagues, we still feel that quite a great number of issues, probably policy issues that are still pending and remain unresolved.

So I mean broadly, we would like to see a process put in place that kind of ensures that inputs, and proposals, opinions originated from you know various headquarters, not just from GAC but from various headquarters, you know can be traced, and also that a thorough and reason explanation of the decisions taken including the rationale used and data sources used to make those decisions. So we would like you know those provided, and then for GAC in particular, I think it's very important you know for both to give us an update on the most recent sum of the very many pending issues. Thank you.

Heather Dryden:

Thank you, Kenya. And to put more finer point on it, the summaries that have been posted following our public comments, we don't consider them as meeting the need that we are describing here. Would someone from the Board like to respond?

Peter Dengate Thrush:

I think we generally agree. I think this is exactly the same issues that we heard with the present strategy consultation, and the (inaudible 0:36:02) tips and relation to that, and very much the same advice that is now coming from the Accountability and Transparency Review Team. The Board has expressed the same

view as well, and I think what we will be taking the recommendations from the Accountability and Transparency Review Team, who have put some attention into how this can be done. I think what's clear, there's a community requirement for this, and we'll be moving forward to do it.

Heather Dryden:

Thank you. Do I have any more requests - UK please.

Mark Carvell:

Thank you, Heather. It's Mark Carvell from the UK Ministry, the Department for Business Innovation and Skills. So my Ministry is not a ICT regulator, we do a lot of policy work with regard to the ICT sector, but promoting the interest of business within government and internationally, and promoting innovation is a key role for us. It's part of our mandate.

So the New gTLDs initiative is something we really look to as an important contribution to innovation and promoting opportunity for business, promoting competition in the global economy. So it's something that we've always supported in principle. I mean we contribute to all the processes to achieve that, and that's what - that's the approach we've been certainly taking.

But we're still not confident that the benefits to be derived from this are going to outweigh the costs. This is still a fundamental problem we have. And that's why the comment about the timing of the economics papers, the second phase economics paper is so important, because that's crucial to establishing the fundamentals of what this initiative is all about. And you know to have received

it on Friday just is desperately unhelpful for us as the policy makers, advancing and supporting initiatives to promote competition and to both promote innovation, not to have these key supportive documents which are going to have the data and the analysis, that supports the initiative.

And at the same time, we in government, I mean we've picked up on the DAG as soon as it was published. I ran it across stakeholders in the UK. I ran it to the intellectual property office in the UK because the most representatives we've received have been from brand owners, the rights holders; they're the ones that have been the most agitated about this. I think they also recognized the potential opportunities, but the big issue for them is the costs. And we've discussed in the UK, the rights protection mechanisms contained in the DAG. We pushed for changes. We've had very good dialogue with Kurt and the team. We've had excellent interaction, it's been very helpful, being very open, and we really appreciate that.

But we're still, I think, not there as regards the rights of protection. It's - there are problems in the two key mechanisms, the trade marketing house, and the URS, and we see the contributions coming from the right protection community from the organizations from WIPO, INTA, in Europe, EXTA, also expressing the same key problems, the rights protection mechanisms are still not effective enough. And that's what's coming through to us in the Ministry.



So it's a problem and I think if you're really hoping to sign off the guidebook this week, I think that's something you really ought to reconsider. We worked hard, we've gone through the detail, we've consulted stakeholders, we've listened to what people in the community are saying, and we think you're not there, you're not - you've been doing a lot of valuable work, you're putting a lot of effort into it in a very open way, but you're not there. That's our main problem with this.

And as I say we want to see it happen. We want to see innovation, competition really take off and the global information economy benefit as a result. But I just don't think you're there yet. And we have the detail. We're going to capture it in the communiqué, which Bill has referred to earlier, the detail of that, I won't go into the detail now, there's a lot of very detailed points. But if they were looked at carefully again, maybe we could get there in time for San Francisco. I hope so. Thanks.

Heather Dryden:

Thank you very much, United Kingdom. I would just add that because we've been meeting with various parts of the community while here in Cartagena, that UK experience seems to echo some of the comments that we've received from colleagues here that are primarily from the private sector in particular.

And business - the business constituency within the GNSO for example have expressed significant issues that they see as remaining. And when you hear that the support is coming mainly from the registries and registrars who have a particular relationship

to this organization and to the impacts that would follow from introducing the new gTLD program, I think that's really given colleagues around this table pause, so I would just add that really to emphasize what the UK has said. I have Germany requesting to speak. Please go ahead.

Hubert Schoettner:

Yes, thank you. I just fully want to second our colleague from UK, because this right protection issue is also a very important issue for our country. And I want to add one issue that it is raised by our community in particular, that is, to certain forms of protection mechanisms that are accepted or agreed now in the final guidebook, they require substantive examinations from - by undertaken by the - in the jurisdiction where this trademark was granted and our - and many other jurisdictions don't have this extended - substantive examination and therefore, we feel that this is some kind of discrimination of our trademark, and this causes quite a lot of problems in our community because we - frankly, from our government, cannot accept such - such a regulation. Thank you.

Heather Dryden:

Norway please.

Ornulf Storm:

Thank you very much, Chair. It's Ornulf Storm from Norway. I just also wanted to echo the strong voice of UK here. So thank you very much for that. I think that covers a lot of the concerns that a lot of the GAC members do have.

On the other hand, an example of a positive input, I think we had an exchange here with Kurt in the sort of first days we had here, and like we were concerned about this weakening of the post delegation procedures for geographic names that you - not sort of that you had taken out this will comply with the court decision and now sort of may implement and now believe that you do have had some exchange with the ccNSO on that and I'm aware of the response from Kurt, so I just wanted to hear a confirmation by the Board that actually that you still intend to retain the wording, or at least the powers of the governments to retain that that was described in the DAG 4 on that you will accept the court ruling on any sort of disputes when there is a letter of support or non-objection, when you have gTLDs of geographic names that have been given that protection like city, capital city names, etc. So I just wanted to have that confirmed. Thank you.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Well, I think we can Kurt confirm it again if you want to - Kurt could you perhaps repeat the position that you reported earlier.

Kurt Pritz: Hi. Thank you Peter and Heather. And thank you for the comment. Now since your comment we received a similar comment from the ccNSO and have had time to go back and analyze the guidebook, and will change the language in the letter. We will also put language in the guidebook, proper, not in the letter that ICANN will follow the rulings of courts in those jurisdictions where the geographical names are.

Ornulf Storm: Yes, thank you for that, but at least that's an example that we are moving forward, but as sort of you've heard today, I think a lot of the countries do feel that we are not there yet, so but at least there are progress. So that's a positive sign, thank you.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Thanks. While you're doing that, let me just perhaps acknowledge Mac, just to say thank you for that description of the process that goes on. I think sometimes when we have these exchanges and we talk about documents not being done in time, etc., we do appreciate that many, many, if not all the delegates you know are doing the kind of process that you described. And we also, because we have to do that ourselves, we understand what it means to take this material to various interest groups in your companies, collate their responses, synthesize it, explain it to them because perhaps they've got it wrong, and you've been here, and you know these things, you know so really we do want to go on record as acknowledging the effort that goes into being a member of the GAC and coming here and contributing. So thank you for that. Dennis.

Dennis Jennings: Thank you, Peter. I hear the phrase not there yet on a number of occasions. And I wonder is there any - any guidelines from those countries who say we're not there yet, as to what - when we will know or when you will know we are there? Is there any metric, because I'm sure it's very frustrating for you, and it's equally frustrating for us, you know, it's like the child in the back of the car, are we there yet? Are we there yet? Are we there yet?

We need to know when we will be there. And we certainly tried to work on that, but it would be very helpful when GAC members say we're not there yet, whether you could also illustrate what the destination, when we will know that we're there. I'm not saying this is an easy thing, but it doesn't add specificity to the discussion just to know we're not there yet.

Heather Dryden:

UK, US, you wanted to respond to that particular point? Yes.

Mark Carvell:

Thanks. I talked about lack of confidence that the benefits are going to outweigh the costs. I think we will know whether we're there or getting very near there when we understand that those benefits do outweigh the costs. That was - that is a key sort of turning point; if we can get to that position, that the benefits for business, for the global economy, for opportunity for business are going to be greater, scaled up, greater than the costs to brand owners and those who are going to have to shell out big time, in order effectively to subsidize in their view, perhaps subsidize the process.

So it's a question of getting to that confidence level based on effective analysis and understanding of what the opportunities are and mitigating to best efforts the downside, which is what the brand owners see. I mean there's a tremendous downside. So there's a kind of balance, a tipping point, if you like, and we're not there yet, and when we are confident that we are there, then we might see the date - the end date coming up. We've all invested huge amounts of time in this. We don't want to see it all collapse

into a pile you know in the middle of this room. We all want to see something come out of this protracted process; so that's my response to what you're saying. Anyway, thank you.

Heather Dryden:

Thank you, UK. I'm going to give the floor to Malta, because he's next on the list. And I suspect he's going to say something about the public interest and then over to the United States.

Joseph Tabone:

Yes, thanks very much. I think that you know much of what needed to be said has been but it's really very much reinforcing essentially the message that's being conveyed by my really UK colleague that you know when really we come here, we meet as a GAC, we have done that really following very substantial consultation in our respective countries, with various constituencies, I think that - there's a group that really speaks for the public interest. I'm sure that every sector group is speaking for the public interest in a way, but in our case, I think that you know we're speaking to the broader public interest.

We speak with really community groups, with business, with of course affecting really government interest in this. And that's why one of the things that really surprised me, comment that I heard at the opening of this meeting is that there was sense that our views were converging on this issue of the new gTLDs. I mean I find that really very surprising in view of the comments or the representations that we have made in this that you know we're not aware that you know we seem to be really crossing each other in our communications.

And I think that's a concern that we have in this, and that we feel that there was something that we need to address. I think that we spent an awful amount of time discussing these issues, and it's not a country taking a position in exception to these, I think that the representations that we have made, they represent a consensus, and we feel that we have not had really the benefit of - in many instances either a response to key suggestions that are being made, or in the latest communication is the rationale behind really turning the - this supposedly informed advice down. Thank you very much.

Heather Dryden:

Thank you, Malta. United States and then I think Peter has some comments.

Suzanne Sene:

Thank you, Heather. I really don't need to take very much time, because my colleagues have been quite eloquent in expressing our views as well. It is the whole issue of feeling confident that the benefits will outweigh any cost and making sure that we can mitigate the cost. And so it is confidence. We are held accountable to our governments and to our citizens. So we are actually held accountable, each and every one of us, and there is an expectation that's quite legitimate that there will be some return on this investment. Okay. There's significant resources that are being applied.

What I would be curious though, Dennis, and for your views and the entire Board is how will you know when you are there? How

---

are you making that determination? Since we haven't seen a rationale for the decisions that have been take, that's very clear, how is it you will arrive at that determination? Thank you.

Heather Dryden:

Peter or the Board. Does someone want to --

Peter Dengate Thrush:

I'm going to have the pleasure of calling on Bertrand who's in this unusual position of not being on the GAC, but not quite being on the Board, but we're going to claim him, so we're going to ask if the GAC would mind if Bertrand spoke.

Bertrand de la Chapelle:

Hello everybody, it's indeed an interesting position. A quick comment on that. The discussion on the economic study are - is addressing actually two issues. One is whether there should be a gTLD program or not, and whether the overall benefit of opening up is positive. I think no one and I've been participating in this for the last four years; I don't think anybody in the community at any stage has drawn the conclusion from the two first rounds that we should stop, never do new gTLD program, not open.

There is a convergence, the agreement within the GNSO was to launch the program or to decide the program into '08, and the GAC and all the other actors have worked consistently to do this. The question is how is it shaped, and this leads not to the global benefit of opening up versus not opening up. It goes to whether there is undue burden to certain categories of actors, because the cost benefit ratio is not only on the global scale, it's also for different categories. And when you evaluate the cost benefit ratio, you have



two ways to make it good; either you increase the benefits, and it is very difficult to evaluate because it is an innovative process, and we don't exactly know, something may be very beneficial, but it's a big question mark, or you can try to reduce the costs.

And the reason why Mark and others are saying the main challenge and the main problem today is that the intellectual property actors are the most vocal and the most concerned. It is because they are the ones where the costs are anticipated as being the biggest, because it's not only the application, it is the fear of defensive registrations of the second level, and it is the fear of having to get into a difference of registration at the top level, which is even worse, because it's getting into a program where they don't know what they could do with this for many of them.

So I just wanted to interject this because at that stage, one of the main elements is not so much to evaluate whether there is a high benefit for the brand owners in the opening up, it is to have a clear understanding of what the costs are for them, the ones that they clearly evaluate is simple. But the biggest problem is the big question mark of the expected cost that they can anticipate.

And here we have two questions. For the second level registration, there is a question mark, but if something goes wrong, the process can be tightened up later on. So the question will be is the possibility to tighten up the control and the compliance enough to reduce the fear so that the anticipated costs are lower? But on the top level domain, is the mechanism that is in place enough to

alleviate the fear they have that they will have to get into defensive registration? And to answer Suzanne's question as best as I can, I think if we consider there are other issues, if we consider that one of the main stumbling block is this fear, we will know we are there when the specific community will say it's not everything we would like, but we can live with it.

And it's the same for the GAC on geographic names, the GAC may not get everything it wanted, but if there is a sufficient alleviation of fear, there will be a moment where the cost of continuing to wait will then override the benefits of doing it. Thank you.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Thanks Bertrand. Heather?

Heather Dryden: Are there any more requests to speak on this? Norway.

Ornulf Storm: Thank you, Chair. Just a quick remark on Petron's comments on the compliance issues, like we heard when we had the meeting with GNSO, with the business constituents is expressed concern that they were currently compliance issues, and compliance problems. And they will not be less when you open up for quite a lot of new registries. So that - and that is not our comments, this is from the business constituency in the GNSO, that this is - might also be a huge challenge on the compliance issues. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Thank you, Norway. It might worth noting that one of the outstanding issues that isn't specifically aimed at the new detailed D program, but more broadly is in relation to the law enforcement

recommendations regarding due diligence and the registrar accreditation agreements. The GAC endorsed those proposals and so we would be very interested to have a full - some response as to exactly what of those recommendations have been adopted or will be adopted in terms of due diligence and those agreements. Rod?

Rod Beckstrom:

Yes. Just to speak to the good question that Mark raises from the United Kingdom and other parties and Petron I think articulated well regarding economic costs. It is generally extremely difficult to estimate the value of innovation. That's just a general economic research issue. Because it's very difficult to unpredict the unpredictable future as opposed to the forecastable conventional future that you know from history. There are some, you know possible you know data points that do seem helpful and if there's not a master database I know of globally in one simple place of material risk to corporations.

But one thing that I would observe is that in the United States of America, corporations have to file 10K documents. And a requirement in a 10K document is to disclose material financial risks. And a cursory review shows that the only listings of material risk relating to domain names and/or any registrations or value of domain names has been with respect to the financial transfer of assets relating to registrars or registries.

And what that could suggest and should suggest is that corporations that take their responsibilities very seriously with respect to disclosure, to the extent any corporations felt that

defensive registrations present or future contingent were material enough to require disclosure in their financial statements, I believe have a legal obligation to do so. And to our knowledge that has not been a practice. Now that - there is - that does not answer the question, and I'm not suggesting for a moment that it answers the question specifically of the - the precise benefit, because again without an ability to estimate innovation, it's very difficult to do. It does provide a boundary condition, and I think one data point that could - that is relevant.

Heather Dryden:

Thank you, Rod. Switzerland.

Thomas Schneider:

Thank you. First of all, I have to say that for a country like ours there are 15 days of having time to go through the documents are also quite problematic, also because of the reason that we are currently trying to save another multi-stakeholder process, which is the IGF which also consumes a lot of resources. But the point that I would like to make is that first of all we share the concerns that have been expressed by our colleagues, and in addition to that, I would like to add one point.

We have been talking about lack of confidence about avoiding costs for at least certain stakeholders which I think is an important point. At the same time, I would add that there might also be a lack of confidence in - that this actual system as proposed provides for - that the global stakeholders can really profit from the opportunities the new gTLDs would give in the sense that also

---

stakeholders which of a lower financial and other powers will be able to profit from the program.

And I think if there will be some time you could maybe develop the confidence of the global community and how they can profit from the opportunity of new TLDs and in that connection I would say that we are interested in the work of the joint SOAC working group on applicant support. Because we think that this is an important issue that we should not only talk about economic interests of the big stakeholders, but maybe also the smaller ones, and also social interests. Thank you.

Peter Dengate Thrush:

Can I just quickly respond to the people who are familiar with the prices are misled. The reference to 15 days was the GAC's reference to 15 days. The GAC said that the GAC would respond to us if it had the material more than 15 days in advance, that's in a GAC letter to us. We posted the guidebook 24 days in advance. So please don't - I agree with you, 15 days is an incredibly difficult time to respond, but just be clear that's - we're just responding to the GAC's indication that the GAC would do that within 15 days - 15 working days.

Heather Dryden:

I think we may need to revisit that, and I believe that the comment from Germany was that 15 days is notionally a useful target, but when you're getting hundreds and hundreds of pages of documents on conflict issues all at the same time, then the 15 days really starts to look inadequate.

---

Peter Dengate Thrush: It was ambitious, I agree.

Heather Dryden: Ambitious, okay. Switzerland, do you want to respond?

Thomas Schneider: Just a quick comment on this. I think the 15 days were thought as the minimal requirement, but that does not prohibit to be as early as possible in order to facilitate our work. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: European Commission - oh, Bruce, yes, Bruce go ahead.

Bruce Tonkin: Just a really quick comment on scale. The documents actually are separated into what's called a clean version and a redline version, and so most of us read the redline version, it should mean that we've previously read the full version at some point. So 15 days is not that unreasonable for the redline, I would think. But except when there's a new document like economic studies, that needs time, but just to put context, it's not like it's a fresh set of 400 pages, the actual amount of changes in the latest version is not 400 pages of changes.

Heather Dryden: If I may, I think the point is that there have been a number of separate documents including the DAG, and that if the issue is complex and governments require time to consult and to brief, based on the latest developments, that really does take a lot of time. And I think we need to be very clear on that point, because I think this gets lost again and again. And governments feel that they have to explain again and again around this lengthy process they have to undertake in order to develop positions and gain the

---

approvals they need to come here and be effective. European Commission.

William Dee:

Yes, sorry to prolong the agony on this one actually, but I feel a bit guilty sitting here in silence because it - the 15 days came from me during the meeting in Cairo, when we met with the Board. And I'm sorry if there is a misunderstanding, but my proposal was that it should be at least 15 days before you would even consider it at a meeting. If it came later than that, we'd defer it to the subsequent GAC meeting or to an intercessional period. I think there's no indication, actually certainly no intention on my part that 15 days would mean that we would give advice on something.

It was just that if it came less than 15 days, we would not be able to consult with colleagues and capital and we would gratefully receive a document with request for advice, but they would be impractical and we were warning you that if it's less than 15 days, we're not even going to have it on our agenda. That was my suggestion. So I just wanted to clarify that.

Peter Dengate Thrush:

Well, let me let you off the hook. We weren't referring to any oral comment you made in Cairo. We're referring to the last letter from the GAC signed by the Chairman saying that there would be responses filed if we did this. I mean that's all.

Heather Dryden:

Any other requests for the floor? Germany.

Hubert Schoettner:

Yes, thank you Chair. I had one more question regarding our geographic names discussion before. And I just want to make aware one issue, maybe not so aware in the community here. That is the question of yes geographic names and that in many countries, there is not a central government responsible, but local governments, like city mayors and states, for the states. And this government have problems in getting access to information from ICANN.

They say it in a very general way, because they are normally not part of the ICANN community, and for a GAC member it is a bit difficult to exchange and give *de facto* legal advice what means in the guidebook at page 318, how do I interpret it. Therefore, my request is that I can have some possibilities or facilities to - in respect of this - this communities to inform them in a separate way or whatever that they can be aware of the problems they are now facing.

Because sometimes it's a passive one, the applicant knows what he has to do, and he is involved in the discussion, governments sometimes are confronted with these issues and don't know what - what would be the adequate answer, and they are - they have to - they don't know perfectly what is in the guidebook and they have the same problems on this respect. Thank you.

Heather Dryden:

Are there any more requests of the floor?



Peter Dengate Thrush: I wonder whether we shouldn't move forward from here and to looking at the suggestions that some of us have made about taking this forward. I was wanting to propose something like a 13 page analysis that sets out the exchanges between us and the progress that's been made in relation to geographic names, people listening earlier may have drawn the impression that the GAC is simply sending the same letter to us over and over again, and we're not receiving it, which of course what's happened is the parties have substantially changed their positions in relation to geographic names and the analysis of that is very complex, starting from the very general principle that you mentioned earlier. Whether or not we need to set up a full day or a day and a half, and I can just report the experience that the Board had in terms of concentrating on this at the Trondheim workshop was for us very helpful.

We actually do think there are only a limited list of issues and we've moved from an entire objection based on geographic names, now to much more around the objection process and various other issues. And you listed earlier, Germany, all the progress of the agreement that's been made and there seems to be acceptance by the GAC that it's original claim for protection at the second level has moved and so on. So I mean we have actually made considerable progress on this issues.

And I just wonder whether, Heather, you know if we scheduled a day or a day and a half or two days at some stage between now and San Francisco, that might - they might work. It certainly worked very well for the Board coming to grips with these issues.

Heather Dryden: Thank you for that suggestion. I see a little bit of nodding. So I think that means that we are open to doing that, and we appreciate the offer to continue in that spirit. All right. Norway.

Ornulf Storm: Thank you, Chair. I'll just, for clarification, are we moving towards a little bit on this A&T Review Team issue or-

Heather Dryden: We certainly can, Peter?

Peter Dengate Thrush: Sure.

Heather Dryden: I believe there were a couple of issues that colleagues wanted to raise. So Norway, you can start.

Ornulf Storm: Thank you. Just this relates a little bit to the Norwegian (inaudible 1:12:01) to comments to the A&T Review Team recommendations. In our comment we just made a brief note regarding your plans based on the recommendations in the present strategy committee regarding exploring ways for ICANN to - for legal - international legal entity established outside California. So I just wanted if there is enough dates to have the Board to discuss this since then, or - yes, just the status basically, if that has been discussed as an issue. Thank you.

Peter Dengate Thrush: No, that hasn't been discussed by the Board, and I'm not sure exactly how the recommendation is coming - I can't recall quite now how the recommendation coming up from the ATRT is going

---

to do that, but once we get there, we will certainly take - pay careful attention to the recommendation.

Heather Dryden: France please.

Christian Tison: This is all from the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This is also the point we raised in our comments and we would like this to be taken into account. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: United Kingdom?

Mark Carvell: Thanks. As we're on the topic of the A&T Review Team, I just wanted to express our anxiety in the UK that the recommendations from the Review Team are implemented as soon as possible, and that you don't hold back on ones that - on specific recommendations that can be implemented fairly speedily without too much complex process to go through or legal course or whatever that might be required.

So those recommendations that can be implemented quickly are done so and not contingent on more difficult stuff being resolved later on, so that we can - in our engagements, internationally with the ITU and in the UN, this is a point I just wanted to underscore as well, we do have multiple international dossiers, a number of us, and we were active in the UN speaking for them - the modest stakeholder approach to internet governments and in the ITU and elsewhere.

---

So what I wanted to say was we would like to sort of update interlocutors you know ICANN has picked up this recommendation and is already going ahead, other stuff requires more detailed planning, it's going to take a little while, but we don't want everything to sort of slow up into one package that is delivered at the end of six months. We would be really, really disappointed if that were the approach to be taken. Thanks.

Peter Dengate Thrush:

Could I just interject and say that we haven't received the recommendation, so we haven't actually started considering that but quite clearly it would be a great mistake, I think for us to hold all them up and try to pass them as a package, they cover so many areas, that would just make an enormous block in the ICANN system.

I do take the point about wanting - a reporting to your interlocutors and maybe we can set that up as part of the ATRT page that's currently listing - has been listing the activities of the work on the same; we have the affirmation of commitment to page, I'm sure we can set up some kind of reporting mechanism and perhaps just list the recommendations and then you know we can have a big tick along side them as they go off or the date of implementation, I absolutely agree that there's much communication about that as possible.

What we've been recent - what the Board has stressed and having had a preliminary contact with the ATRT about the sort of doing a sanity check on the recommendations which I think was helpful to

---

the team, was just the Board in return said look, the most useful thing you can give to us with those recommendations is some sense of the priority of them, because in some cases the highest priority will be some of the biggest changes and they will involve obviously substantial budgets, maybe even some by-law issues to be changed.

So there will have to be a reasonably comprehensive implementation program developed, from my personal preference, obviously one of these we would do is pick off the cheap and the easy and do them straight away. There's no reason at all not to - not to, if it's a recommendation that we've accepted, you know to get on with them. Thanks.

Heather Dryden: I have Norway and then Denmark.

Ornulf Storm: Thank you very much, Chair. Yes, I would also like to re-emphasize on the issue that UK raised, that's some of the recommendations we - from the Norwegian perspective we see as very urgent, and we also would give you the heads up here that this is - that some of the recommendations would probably need to be addressed fairly quickly. So just to keep that in mind. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Denmark.

Julia Kahan-Czarny: Thank you. I would like to first echo France and Norway for the PSC recommendation about the internationalization of ICANN, because we also wrote that in our comments to the ATRT. And

also, one issue we raised is the implementation issue that has just been raised, that we also agree with. Thank you.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Dennis?

Dennis Jennings: Yes, thank you, Peter. As Peter's pointed out, we haven't yet received and carefully considered the ATRT report and we will of course. So I'm not - I'm speaking personally, if I may. I think the report is terrific and I think the recommendations are very much to the point and we've already started work even before the report on a number of areas, training, better publication of documents, supporting the decisions and so on. So I would expect, but I can't speak for the Board.

I would expect that when we get the report, the new BGC will take the report and will map out an implementation plan, will prioritize those things that can be done immediately, some of them may be done by the time we get the report, and we'll publish that, and we will have metrics to show how rapidly we're progressing against that. Some of them I think will be done within weeks, and some of the more complicated ones will take a year or 18 months or whatever.

But certainly I would be confident, and again, I'm only speaking for myself, that before the next review in two years time, after the receipt of the report, all those - all those things that can be implemented will have been implemented. Now, there's some tricky things in there. But I'm - well, I'm just speaking for myself,

I think it's a terrific report and it gives us a wonderful opportunity to just take it and do it.

So you know I just want to give you a sense and a lot of Board members have that sense that we're going to run with this and make it happen, and you need not be concerned that we're going to be in any way hesitant. We will have to examine it to make sure that some of these things are really implementable at a reasonable cost, and within our by-laws. But the majority I think can and I think they will be done. Thank you.

Heather Dryden:

Thank you, Dennis. With that I think we're approaching the end of our session, so unless there's anything from the Board side that you would like to flag.

Peter Dengate Thrush:

Well, I think we should be - you know we're having a meeting tomorrow morning in fact at 8:00, to start the discussion about some Board votes on Friday which may well be counted as GAC advice. So is this something that you want to talk about now, or should we leave that until eight o'clock tomorrow morning, for those who are participating.

Heather Dryden:

I think we can discuss it at 8:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.

Peter Dengate Thrush:

Okay.

---

Heather Dryden: Yes, I see some confused colleagues. It's a time that's just been set, so have a look at your email for the details. But we will be meeting in this room at 8:00 a.m.

Male: Heather, may I make a quick remark?

Heather Dryden: Yes.

Male: And just thank all the participants in the GAC for in many cases your years and years of work on this and other important topics, and certainly in many cases in the case the guidebook related to new gTLDs, there have been changes made from what the GNSO recommended and private sector groups recommended to accommodate concerns that you've had, and seek to address those, whether those are intellectual property related, whether it's a geopolitical, I mean a geographical names, etc. But I just want to thank you very, very much for your good will and your exceptional efforts. Thank you very much.

Heather Dryden: And let me thank the Board for coming today. We always appreciate you spending time to meet with us, and we'll see you in the corridors. Thank you.

[End of Transcript]