EN

Heather Dryden:	Good afternoon everyone. If you can just get seated, we can begin. Thanks. Okay, let's get started, we have a lot to discuss this afternoon. So welcome to Cartagena, for the first of our GAC meetings over the next week or so. Before we begin with the first anticipated agenda item on new gTLDs, I have an unexpected issue to raise, and as it turns out the Indian secretariat is unable to be here in Cartagena to provide support to this meeting, so I would just like guidance or permission from colleagues here for me to make a request of ICANN for that support to be provided this week, because it is an unanticipated development, and unfortunate, but due to unforeseen circumstances they were unable to provide that support to us here this week. So may I take it that I may make that request to ICANN? Okay, thank you.
	Okay, so new gTLDs, as promised Kurt Pritz is here to present to us over the next 45 minutes or so, various issues that are outstanding with the new gTLDs program, and hopefully Kurt will be able to respond to some questions and clarifications. Would you prefer to do that at the end, Kurt? Or as you go through?
Kurt Pritz:	I can take questions as we go; the presentation is broken up into blocks, so maybe we can set them up that way.
Heather Dryden:	Okay, let's do that. So without any further ado, over to you, Kurt.
Kurt Pritz:	Thanks very much, and it's really good to see everybody again, and I'm glad everybody made it here. I've been here for several days and found it quite delightful, especially when it stops raining.

We've broken up – everybody knows Karen Lintz (sp), who's my co-worker and has done a tremendous amount of work on this program. We've broken up the presentation here into a couple of segments; one is what are the guidebook updates?

So this is the fifth version of the guidebook, and you know, what's changed? So we want to let everybody know what that was, and then a brief discussion of the overarching issues, the so-called overarching, or most important issues that have been worked over a period of quite some time, and give you a status update there, and then finally there are some specific GAC topics that we got from the different letters we've received from the GAC, so I wanted to touch on those issues, but certainly if I missed any of them, that would be a time to bring them up there.

So go ahead, Karen; the first part of the talk is about what's changed in the guidebook, and I suppose I should – I'll try one here, since this is my first presentation, we'll see how it goes. But one question is "what the heck is a proposed final guidebook" we've called them draft guidebooks up until now. A proposed draft, I think the model I think most about when this was published is how ICANN goes about its budgeting process, and the problem we tried to confront was how do we ever post a version of an applicant guidebook and not have it for public comment? Say, well this is the final guidebook and the Board will consider it, so you really can't, right? Because there'll be comments anyway.

So looking at the ICANN budget model, we post a proposed budget for consideration and then the Board can consider the budget right up until the time it goes on budget and can consider comment on that budget right up until that time. So it's sort of a mechanism to allow ongoing comment, while the guidebook can be considered for approval. So just like the budget, the Board could elect to vote on the guidebook and vote its approval or not, but there's other options too, right? The Board could, as it's done with the budget in the past, direct based on comment, that certain changes be made in the guidebook, so it could make an approval of the guidebook conditional on changes.

It could direct certain changes be made, and then have the guidebook resubmitted for approval, or it could send the guidebook back and say "Lookit, there's more community discussion required on these issues, more in-depth discussion, so we need to do that." So it provides the opportunity to put up for potential approval of the guidebook, but not foreclose public comment, so that's the thinking about what a proposed guidebook is. So there are a number of redlines through the guidebook, and as usual we've published a redline and a clean version of the guidebook along with the comment analyses as usually done. What's changed in this guidebook?

Well, module one kind of describes the whole process and the requirements for applicants, so there's commitments in module one about delegation rates; delegation rates are very important when it comes to root zone stability. Because if we don't exceed a certain

delegation rate, then there's the thought that there's no issues with root zone stability, so that's important. We've amended significantly, background screening criteria. You'll remember in the last guidebook we used the word terrorist, and that was very controversial, so that's been deleted. Instead, we've worked with a firm and some standards, some existing developed standards in background screening, on certain criteria, and incorporated those into the guidebook. I think everybody here might be familiar with the lifting of restrictions on cross-ownership? There might be questions on that.

There's placeholders for applicant support that a Working Group is doing to provide support to applicants, both non-economic support and then a way to move forward into financial support for applicants later on. And then there's some more discussion about IDN variants. In module two, the string requirements, what TLD string can be is changed, because the ITF is about to publish a new RFC on that, and essentially what that says is no numbers, unless it's an xn—which is the puni code for an IDN. But otherwise, in ASCII there won't be any numbers in TLDs.

And then we've enhanced, we've included another list, a UNESCO list into the number of regions and continents that are protected, and that was for a specific reason that I can't remember now. But we've slightly expanded the names of continents and regions that are protected, by the inclusion of that UNESCO list. In module three, which is dispute resolution and objections, we've expanded protections that included protection for IGOs at the top level, based

on discussion that we've had all through this, and then recent letters we've gotten from WIPO (sp) and the OECD.

In the community objection, there was a complete defense to community objections, and that was sort of controversial, so that's been eliminated, and instead every community objection has a complete hearing on its merits. And then something I'm sure we can talk about is the objection formerly known as morality and public order, and it's not certain that it's called limited public interest objection, but that might be one of a series of candidates of names. It includes amendments to that objection that stem from the Working Group, so called rec six Working Group that has been working on this, so it provides for government notification, so governments can provide notification to TLD applicants if it so chooses about controversial names.

It adds treaties to be considered as part of the standards, and changes some references so now we've reworded it to refer to principles of international law, and if you read the report you'll understand what that changes. Module four is perfect? We talked, you know, module four is the community priority evaluation, if community TLD wants a priority, a lot of discussion and analysis went into the scoring mechanisms and the criteria, and there was some tweaking, but in the end, no change. And in module five, we provided additional detail on the Board role, how the Board will remain in charge of oversight for the process, but not approve each and every application, but will rather receive evaluator reports, quality assurance reports, and take measure to ensure that the

process is operating as the Board tells us to operate through its approval when it happens.

In the trademark clearinghouse, we got a lot of comments last time about specifics regarding the nature of substantive review of trademarks before they're entered into the clearinghouse, so the definitions there are more aligned with actual law, especially in European countries. In URS, we think we've strengthened the uniform rapid suspension of domain names, by shortening the response time given to registrants, and we think there's other protections for registrants besides the response time, so we tried to put the rapid back in URS, in accordance with comments from the business and IP constituency, and in the registry agreement associated with the changes on vertical integration, in order to prevent domain name abuse, we've inserted a code of conduct.

So those are the changes with the guidebook. I don't know if that's the right level of discussion or you want me to dive into more detail. If you're new, I guess I should apologize, but when I look around the table I see a lot of acquaintances and we've had this talk before, so I tried to keep it at a level that reflected their understanding.

Heather Dryden: My sense is that a more detailed discussion would be useful. So if you could go into a bit more detail on each of those topics, I think some are probably of more interest than others, in terms of what the GAC would give priority to, so we can spend more time on those. Before you do, I just wanted to mention that we have

requested that the air conditioning be turned on or turned up in this room, I know it's quite warm, so hopefully that will happen soon. And also, in order to assist with the transcription later on, of the recording of these meetings, if you could state your name clearly when you're speaking, in addition to me doing my best to recognize who's asking for the floor, it would help the transcription. Okay, back to you, Kurt. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz: I don't know what to say next. Could we just say questions on module one? I could talk ten minutes about each one, but then we'd be here for a really long time, and there's three other segments to the presentation. So let's see, I'll just pick some. So –

Heather Dryden: Sweden, Maria please.

Maria Häll: This is Maria Häll from the Swedish government, thank you very much for your presentation. It was a little bit brief, of course, but we have the chance now I think to go a little bit more into details. Actually, briefly, and more in general, it would be very interesting to listen to a little bit more how you have considered the GAC advice concerning this – actually draft applicant guidebook version four, and how much that corresponds to what is happening in this version. Also, if you have had any concerns about our proposals or advice and if you could meet them or not, in that case why could you and why couldn't you, or a little bit more that one would be helpful, I think. Thank you very much.

Kurt Pritz: I have the GAC letter, so I didn't have to bring it up online, so can I just – I'll just talk for a minute about headings in the GAC letter and how we addressed them, how we discussed them. So on root zone scaling, I think that the guidebook and the GAC are well aligned. We've had long discussions with Ssac and Rsac and the key to this is really that the evaluation process is sort of self limiting. In other words, we'll only process 500 applications at one time, at a maximum.

So that means, even after you do a bunch of math with timelines, even if we get infinitely many applications, we're going to be delegating no more than 1000 TLDs a year, we expect to be delegating 215 to 250 TLDs a year. So having that discussion with Ssac and Rsac put to rest a lot of the concerns about root zone scaling. Plus, one of the issues with root zone scaling was we were concerned about the nearly coincident introduction of new gTLDs, IDNs, IPv6, and DNSsec at the same time, so a lot of that train left the station.

The root zone's signed, some IDNs are delegated, some IPv6s are deployed, and so that sort of coincident introduction is not an issue to the root zone, it's operating fine. So with certain caveats, I think if we were to have a session to discuss differences, there would be no differences in root zone scaling. We certainly have that. Market and economic impacts, do we have a slide for that? Is this alright, that we kind of go off like this? Okay.

So you know on market impacts, we've collaborated with several sets of economists, the last one is a report that was just published, so I think we're up to speed on that. Compass Lexicon through Dennis Carlton did an earlier economic study on the introduction of new gTLDs. Greg Rawston and Michael Katz did a subsequent, the study that was just issued, and the study before that. Josh Wright and Steve Sallup did a study on vertical integration and CRA did a study on the marketplace in general, and then more specifically vertical introduction, so several reports have been issued.

I'm just going to touch on some of the details of this last report. This last report uses the past as a prologue, so it looks at existing gTLDs, specifically it looks at .com, it looks at .museum, it looks at .mobi, and it looks at one other, so this report wonders about the potential competition for .com and how long that will take, and thinks that competition for .com itself is not likely in the near future, but sees value in differentiation, innovation of new TLDs, but says those benefits are not predictable, they're too speculative, and does see value in IDNs and community based TLDs.

The report focuses on trademark protections, it analyzed the past rights protection mechanisms in .biz and .info, and said there was variance in how registries implemented them, and also in the new TLD program there was a need to make them standard and improve upon them. So the market impact basically talks about the benefits of differentiation, IDNs and community based TLDs and pretty much focuses just on trademark protection costs and no

others. So I think that there's nothing ICANN disagrees with in the GAC letter on market analysis and economic impact, there's been a series of independent studies done, all of them look at the benefits of new TLDs, and calls them speculative. They all expect innovation, but does not know where that's going to come from or what it's going to be.

And then instructs us to mitigate costs, which is the purpose of the other overarching issues, the malicious conduct mitigation and the trademark protection. So ICANN has spent, I'll just say between $1 and $2 million on economic studies, on this field with some of the most respected economists there are, some of which have been referred to us by others, not our choice as they're independent. On registry/registrar separation, there's – I don't know, is there a slide on this? – so we agree totally with the GAC position that registry/registrar separation should be done in a way to foster competition and innovation.

And the Board, in discussing this, separated it into two issues, one was whether registries and registrars can be co-owned, and the other is the potential for data abuse. One of the concerns was whether a co-owned registry/registrar could be the source of more abuse because of co-mingled data. The Board decided that whether that's so or not is a matter of contention, but the Board decided to separate those two issues; regulation of this marketplace is difficult because one, ICANN is not a regulator, two, regulations regarding co-ownership are extremely hard to enforce in a compliance regime, and three, there would be much money spent with non

value added service, so the Board decided to let the market develop but put strong preventions in the registry agreement regarding potential abuses of data.

So that's resulted in the code of conduct that's appended to the registry agreement. It's right at the end of the base agreement, increasing auditing requirements and of course, in the case where there's negative effects to competition, those competitions issues can be referred to the proper governmental authorities. So competition, so Department of Justice in the United States, I think the European Commission in Europe. So reading the words that – fostering competition, we think we're in alignment there. As far as protection of rights, so everybody here is familiar with the work that's been done in trademark protection; ICANN created the Working Group of IP constituents, the IRT to develop solutions for trademarks, then tested those trademarks against the policy with the GNSO group, the STI, and also created this temporary drafting group to further hone trademark protections.

So created this sort of network of trademark protections that provides new protections throughout the registry lifecycle, so before a registry is launched the trademark clearing house provides two services to protect trademarks, trademark claims and sunrise. Then after registry launch there's the URS and the post delegation process, and we've also implemented whois. I read in the GAC letter that 50% of respondents didn't understand the implications of the new gTLDs program. I think that's really important, and it's part of ICANN's communication campaign, in which I hope we all

participate in order to ensure that knowledge of the new gTLDs program and its implications for small, medium, and large businesses, both as far as opportunities and risks are well communicated.

So I think that certain improvements have been made since guidebook four into the trademark protections, and I talk about them in module three, but there can be – the community objection's been enhanced, but the URS in response to the IP constituency has been accelerated.   I think gain, the IP constituency and proponents of business will continue to press for more protections, but at the end of the day the protection suggested by the IRT were essentially adopted with the notable exception of the globally protected marks list, which is kind of difficult. So I think ICANN's been responsive there.

Heather Dryden: Kurt, before you move to another topic, would you like to comment on the particular request from the international Olympic committee? I know that there have been a number of GAC members raising this on the GAC list, and how that relates to what you envision regarding trademarks.

Kurt Pritz: Yes, so without looking at the draft reply, which is still in draft form, off the top of my head there's been a couple of improvements and that's inclusion of trademarks approved by statute or protections of treaty organizations, so those should enhance protections for the IOC, but a topic of discussion with them, that we want to have in our meeting is the protection of

generic terms. So I'm not sure what the – to the extent there, their letter talks about protection for trademarks, and there is protection for trademarks in the current guidebook and there's new protections for trademarks protected by statute and also for treaty organizations, so where I'm not sure yet is more or less the protection of what I would call the generic term. If that is trademarked by the Olympic committee, and what the effect of that trademark is, and we plan to have a meeting with their representative while we're here in Cartagena, to work that out.

Heather Dryden: You mentioned generic terms, so are you thinking of examples like .bank?

Kurt Pritz: Well, I was thinking of their letter, and a term like .olympic, and so whether that is protected or not. IOC as an organization could be protected, but Olympic as a generic term, I don't know if that's protected or not. So there's been some improvements, really based on the OECD and WIPO letter, and also the inclusion of trademarks by statute, but I don't know about the other, we are going to meet with them while we're here.

Heather Dryden: Does anyone want to comment on that at this time? Okay, Italy.

Stefano Trumpy: Thank you, so this problem of Olympics, I think if we look at the formalities, like being a protected trademark or not is something that would not, in my opinion, not be an isolated case. I don't know if you have in mind something like having some special provisions in the startup of the new registry, because I'm pretty

sure a case similar to this one will happen again and again, in different time frames, so it's even more complicated. So I ask you what you think about that. Sunrise provisions or what?

Kurt Pritz: So the way the guidebook is constructed and meant to work, there's startup provisions for trademarks that have been expanded somewhat, and then there's a set of protections for community names. So there's a set of protections around there that have a different test, and the community protections are meant to capture place names, or religious organizations or other communities with some standing, meaning they've been in existence for some time, and they have some size. So that combination is meant to cover that, and then the interesting test is to bring up specific examples and see how that might or might not work. That's kind of where we're not in response to the IOC yet, in doing some of that testing.

Heather Dryden: Please, EU Commission.

William Dee: Yeah, thanks, William Dee, European Commission. Actually it's a question about trademarks, but not about the Olympic Committee. I sense perhaps there weren't any more about the Olympics. It relates to the advice given by the GAC in Nairobi, actually, and I think that was on dag 3. I understand that arose because of a concern actually about the fact that there may be different treatment for trademarks depending on which jurisdiction they're in, resulting from the proposal there should be substantive examination requirement for trademarks. Without wanting to read out the whole GAC comment which is quite long, there's basically

a request there should be no discrimination according to jurisdiction. Is that something that's being dealt with in dag 5, in your opinion? Thank you.

Kurt Pritz: Yeah, I think so. I think there's jurisdiction where trademarks have substantive evaluation before they're registered trademarks, and some that are not, and the test varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction; I'm not a trademark attorney, but what the clearinghouse test does is meant to bring those trademarks up to sort of the same test, so even trademarks – all trademarks can be included in the clearinghouse, as long as they're registered, and then how they're used in the sunrise and trademark claims process depends on whether they've had substantive review or not.

If they haven't, the clearinghouse can ask for an application to ascertain that the trademark is used in the same way that a trademark from a jurisdiction with substantive review would go through. So I think through it, I gab, and then I kind of distill it down into all trademarks are included in the clearinghouse. If you want to make a sunrise claim, then the clearinghouse will evaluate whether it's actually in use as is trademarks from other jurisdictions. With regard to IP claims, that test isn't required that trademarks from all jurisdictions can avail themselves of trademark claims. So yeah, I think it is fair, and has been brought up to date.

Heather Dryden: Germany, please.

EN

Hubert Schoettner: Yes, thank you for this clarification. It is our position that there should be no difference between the form of the trademarks whether it is in the jurisdiction that has this extended evaluation or not. By the way, it's not only in respect of the sunrise period where we have this problem, we have it also for the uniform rapid suspension system, where the requirement is, in some cases, that you have to have extended evaluation. I can say speaking on behalf of my government, this we consider quite problematic. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz: So in the past, when new gTLDs were developed, each registry could make its own rules regarding who would have – who could avail themselves of a sunrise process or an IP claims process, and so a registry in some jurisdiction could say trademark registrations from jurisdictions that don't have the substantive review can't avail themselves of the service, and what the guidebook does is allow every single trademark, every single registered trademark gets into a clearinghouse, and then can be evaluated and then the trademark clearinghouse will perform the evaluation if there's use of the trademark or not. So that trademark only has to do that one time for all registries, and then can avail themselves of the sunrise process.

Heather Dryden: Any additional comments on that point? Germany, please.

Hubert Schoettner: Yes, just for clarification, but for this process in the trademark clearinghouse as I understand the fee has to be borne by the trademark owner, and that makes a different practice for different legislation and that is something we think is quite difficult.

CARTAGENA DE INDIAS

Heather Dryden: EU Commission.

William Dee: Yes, I hesitate here because I'm certainly not a trademark lawyer or specialist, but just a question for clarification. Do I understand from what you said, Kurt, that the intention is that trademark owners who can't demonstrate they are using their trademark should lose their rights to protection?

Kurt Pritz: So I'm not a trademark lawyer either, so I think for IP claims all trademarks are honored, and there's a notice given to all potential registrants of an IP claim. For sunrise, trademark owners demonstrate use.

Heather Dryden: Okay, if there are no more comments on that point, Kurt if you could move to the next?

Kurt Pritz: So post delegation disputes with governments, there are two issues, I think. One is that the TLD, the geographic name complies with the laws of that jurisdiction, and we think that is a requirement that can be imposed by the government when it approves the TLD, and that ICANN's agreed to follow the – as for the second point, that ICANN has agreed to follow the rulings of courts in those jurisdictions, and that was incorporated from the last GAC letter, so I think I don't have a lot to say about post delegation disputes with governments. I'd like to go on –

Heather Dryden: I'd like to give the floor to Norway.

Ornulf Storm: Thank you, it's Ornulf Storm from Norway. I comment on this as we read the proposed final version on this topic, this changed wording is a key weakening of the post delegation, because the words have been changed for ICANN will comply to now in the final version it says may implement. So if you can comment on that, the wording establishes a key weakening that ICANN may or may not comply with that court decision. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz: Yeah, I asked that question too. So I think what you read from is the registry agreement, and what ICANN doesn't want to do in its registry agreement is – or the quote you read is from the registry agreement, and what ICANN doesn't want to do is make a commitment to the registries in that regard. So it doesn't – ICANN's compliance with the laws, ICANN's agreement to comply with the laws of a competent jurisdiction don't really have – are related to a registry, so our duties are not to the registry, so that's why the wording isn't firm in the registry agreement. We've sent several emails back and forth about that, but that doesn't weaken ICANN's commitment to comply with the laws or the rulings of the courts.

Heather Dryden: Norway, please.

Ornulf Storm: It's also referred to in this sample, in module two, it's also changed there, but I don't understand the obligations for ICANN if they will be able to comply with the court ruling in the due restriction of the country where the TLD is registered, they must add that into the

contract obligations, with the new registry, unless they will then be sued by the registry if you don't have that as a contract obligation. But do you also then say, is this contract term negotiable? Is it in fact in those cases, where the new registry agreement, where the government gives approval of non objection, you will put that explicitly into that registry agreement, that ICANN will comply with the court decision? So my question is, to clarify, this proposed registry agreement, is it generic to cover everything, or will you then amend those registry agreements you make in those cases where you have support of non-objection that you might not clear in that specific agreement? Please clarify. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz: Yeah, I don't know if I can clarify. I can clarify that ICANN's made the commitment to follow the ruling of the courts, so your idea sounds like a good one, but not being the company lawyer, I don't know. What I will do is take your comment and idea back, and respond back with the way that ICANN can best assure that we're going to comply with our commitment.

Heather Dryden: Thank you, Kurt. Did you want the floor? Okay, please, EU Commission.

William Dee: Thank you, yes sorry. I can't resist the temptation as a native English speaker, but you, it says here a court of competent jurisdiction, but it doesn't say court of competent jurisdiction in the country concerned. Does that mean that there could be other courts which might come into play here? I think the original concern of GAC members was that if a government has a dispute

with a TLD in the same territory where it has an agreement about the operation of that TLD, that the courts we're thinking about our the courts in our country, but I notice that's missing. Is that intentional or is it something that can be updated in the final text?

Kurt Pritz: Yes, I think this was probably a short cut in the slide, but it was intended to be in the country of the TLD.

Heather Dryden: Okay, with that I think we can move to the next –

Kurt Pritz: Geographical names. So I think here there's a difference between the GAC position and what's in the guidebook, I've given this many times, but I just want to introduce this with the guidebook or the GNSO recommendation is really started out a blank sheet of paper as far as protections for geographic names. And in fact, recommended that there essentially should be none, other than those afforded by the community objection procedure, and over the course of many discussions with the GAC and the ccNSO, a fairly systemic set of protections of geographic names have been developed at the top level and second level so that country names and the ISO list and other lists and all their translations are protected at the top level, and country names, in fact, are blocked from delegation, at least from the first round.

A discussion we want to have is maybe that should be changed to until there's new policy advice, so we should have that discussion, and then there's a difference with regard to the definition of country names, and that is that the Board directed that we

CARTAGENA
DE INDIAS

somewhat narrow the name of country names to what's on the ISO and other lists, and not just – they were looking for more definition other than the definition of a meaningful representation of a country name, so that's a difference between the guidebook and the GAC position, but I just want to mention that all the translations of those names are included too, so that's many.

Then with regard to city names, there's so many city names that are generic or shared, that protection for all city names would be problematic, but that Capital city names are protected. Also regional names, also sub-regional names, in the ISO 3166-2 list, which are very many; so I just want to say we've come a long way with this protection for country names at the second level, and I think we have agreement on the second level, so we've come a long way as far as developing geographic names for the GAC. I think something you want to talk about here, and the Board wants to talk about is that where there's a specific difference between policy implementation and GAC advice that there be a good faith approachment to trying to settle those differences, and that's one of the things we want to accomplish here, and to figure out meaningful working sessions, I think that would be a significant accomplishment for ICANN, if the Board and GAC could work together on that.

So I think that's – those are the three clarifications for where there's differences between Board and GAC advice, but again, I want to state that there's been a lot of good faith work to create a lot of protections for geographic names, and we think additional

protections do exist through the community based objections, so I think there's protections there.

Hubert Schoettner: Yes, thank you, and first of all I would like to thank you for the clarification on this last issue, on the community based objection in the final guidebook, which shows that probably at least as we are concerned, our views of the community objection is and should be are not met, because we see it as very difficult because we also see a community objection that has the potential to be an alternative for extending some list with names that has to be protected. But then we need a very clear protection mechanism and they put in an indirect protection mechanism with this community objection.

There are some clauses that we maybe do not understand, but it's really difficult how can, for example, a city or region make sure, and the government of the city make sure that there is some kind of damage occurring in the consequence of the introduction of a TLD, which they are not familiar with, they do not know what the applicant be proceeding, what are the intentions of having this TLD, and now I think that this is one issue where I think a community objection for a city would not be possible, and there are other questions where a government has to demonstrate it is really a representative of a community, this is also something from our understanding, if a local government or mayor of a city that he has was elected, he has the right to be representing the community he is speaking of, and that is something I'd just like to – I do not understand frankly.

Coming to a facility we have in our country, in our country the city names are names of at least administrative regions, are protected by national law that is similar to – maybe it is similar to trademark protection, and I really don't understand whether ICANN would respect this legal protection mechanisms or not, because in this – it is not part of this objection principles up until now, and yes, this perspective is not considered up until now. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz: So can I try to rephrase that to be sure I have an understanding? So if somebody, if an applicant applies for a city name, and says – it's clear in the application that it will represent a city or might represent a city, then community objector could prove detriment, could prove harm, because the applicant has said so. But if the applicant, you know, somebody help me with a generic city – applies for a generic name that's also a city, and says the purpose of my application is this generic purpose, they can't prove detriment, but later that TLD could change its model and in fact cause detriment to the community.

It could be an after the fact, and then what's the remedy of the city, because it's too late to object. Is that right? So I know in – I want to go think about that, but I know in certain cases there's a post delegation dispute model also, if an applicant changes the purpose of its TLD and violates the purpose, you can go back and make an objection even after delegation, and if an applicant doesn't live up to its promises it can, but I think I understand your issue and I want to think about it some more.

Hubert Schoettner: Excuse me if I interact directly, because I do not really understand what could be, because it will end in some kind of panel. Because if you have an objection, probably you receive a counter objection from the applicant, and then it goes to a panel, and there's a panel decision. The panel decision is a yes or no, probably, and yes, there is no way of a compromise, and that is something I wish – you don't have procedures and mechanisms which would try to lead to compromise, because in many cases there will be a possibility, but you only have the chance I accept it or not.

Yes, it makes it also difficult and the question will be, for the community, maybe a city would object because a generic name will be used by some commercial company. Okay, the commercial company will say afterwards, we will not use it as a city name, and have some protection mechanism, that means the whole cost for the panel would rest at the community. It's not only the $5000 for filing the objection, it would be – and that is something every community has to be aware of, I recall this panel decisions, they may end up in very high numbers of US dollars, and it may be a problem for many of the cities or regions that consider their names protected. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Thank you for that, Germany. Norway, would you like to comment?

Ornulf Storm: Yes, thank you. It's Ornulf Storm from Norway. Just a quick comment, I think we will come back to this in the later years, but on the probability to having country and territory names into the g

space, I think a lot of governments have strong opinions, as you see here about city and Capital city names, I think we have even stronger concerns and objections to even touch that and put that into the g space, but still I just want to make a note of that, but I think that will become revisited at a later stage. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Thank you, Ornulf. Did you have any further comments on that? Oh yes, please go ahead Arab League.

Arab League: Thank you, I'm representing (inaudible 0:59:58) and actually the Arab area is one of the regions recently added with the addition of the six regions that are defined by UNESCO, so the term actually that's used at UNESCO is Arab States, and this new geographic regions, or this new list, does not have some sort of a short name or (inaudible 1:00:30) name, so unlike the UN list, I think it does, so for example I don't believe that if Asia and the Pacific decide to apply for a new gTLD to represent that region, they would go for .asiaandthepacific, I mean, that's too long. So I believe there should be a consideration of how to go by the term that that region would choose to apply for, if it chooses to apply for a geoterm. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz: So your specific comment really goes to .arab as opposed to .arabstates, I think, so what we try to do is hang our hat on a list, so what we could do is work together to find where that's published, because that's the results of our research. So I think after this we should look at other lists and see what there is.

CARTAGENA
DE INDIAS

Heather Dryden: Okay, if there's no more on this topic, what else do we have?

Kurt Pritz: Well, the end of the GAC letter goes to support of applicants, and it's something that we all feel passionately about and one of the tests I think we're going to have when we measure the success of the new gTLDs process is whether and how new TLDs and registrars and registrants and users are multiplied in areas where the DNS isn't widely used right now, so we're for that, so we've allocated $300,000 in the budget for non-financial means of support. So in establishing regional service centers or information centers around to help applicants understand the new gTLDs process and apply, the problems a little deeper with providing economic support, that can become very expensive.

The new gTLDs process is a zero sum game, it's revenue neutral, and as the process become more complex over time, my nervousness about being able to evaluate the applications for the amount of the fee increases, so the Working Group that is dedicated to applicant support is charged with finding sources of funds and then uses of funds, how to disperse them. We are helping them actively locate potential sources of grants or other sources of money outside ICANN that can be channeled into this, so we're for that. I think what we haven't talked about in this meeting, because it wasn't part of this GAC letter, but the other GAC letter, is the morality and public order objection, or the rec six Working Group recommendations. What do we have slide wise on that?

And that is that the new guidebook has adopted some of the recommendations of that Working Group but in other areas we're uncertain about the recommendations of the Working Group. Their weight as a policy making body, or their consensus, so one of the discussions we might be able to have with the GAC later in the week is what we think about the objection formerly known as morality and public order. So I discussed that briefly, but I didn't know if there were any specific questions about that now, or an opportunity to create a forum about that later.

Heather Dryden: Are there any questions or comments on that topic? Yes, please, Germany.

Hubert Schoettner: Yes, thank you again. I would like to come back to the trademark issues because I was not very clear whether we're going on with this discussion. I just wanted to know about more ICANN's response to the GAC letter on that forum, because we have raised several issues, I cannot find adequate answers for. One of them, for example, is the question defensive registration. It was mentioned that we, as GAC, see great concerns and in this respect I didn't see an adequate answer, because the GAC notes with great concern that brand owners continue to be faced with substantial and often prohibitive defensive registrations.

This was an initial of our statement regarding trademark, which was not considered in the answer. A second one, which I also think is very important and I think we should further develop means how we could go further is select awareness in the

CARTAGENA DE INDIAS
no. 39 5 - 10 December 2010

trademark owner community of the process which is taking place now within ICANN. They have to be integrated in this process, they have to be aware of this. I would have expected that ICANN gives more answers, what they are going to do.

I think the period we have after this campaign we have after decision of introducing new gTLDS, I think it will be too short to come to an adequate exchange with trademark owners, and by the way, it will be too late for the trademark owners to maybe express their interest and also be part of the process. This concern I have, maybe we as government, we are interested in having this kind of exchange between the various companies and ICANN, but I think it is also ICANN who has to show what would be its mechanism that can will have in this situation.

Kurt Pritz: So, yeah, those are two good points. Let me start with the latter, because I think that's very important. I talked about it a bit before, but it's certainly ICANN's requirement to provide sufficient notice on a broad basis to all regions about the new gTLDs program; it's opportunities and potential costs, so that has to be a goal of the communications campaign, and if we think that can't be accomplished in several months time, then we need to make it longer.

But as envisioned, it's presently several months of heightened communications to our regions, but I and everybody at ICANN clearly agree that that's the goal of the communications campaign, is to avoid harm by any parties not knowing about the new gTLDs

process. It's not to market the new gTLDs process. With respect to defensive registrations, there's been a lot of work done about defensive registrations and whether they're prohibitive or not, and this last version of the economic report, in fact, focuses solely on defensive registrations as the cost associated with the introduction of new gTLDs and I actually think there's other costs, and so do we all, and in all of that the current report admits that – well, there's two points to be made.

One is that defensive registrations don't exist outside the very largest registries, so brand owners aren't defensively registering outside the very largest registries. And two is the purpose of all the new trademark protections, the one clearinghouse for all TLDs, this mandatory sunrise or IP claims period, URS and a post delegation dispute model are all meant to relieve the need for defensive registrations, and certainly they're not tested yet, but it's a uniform set of protections that are all new for all registries, so will there be defensive registrations? Yes, I'm sure there will be. And there'll be many of them. Will the cost be high? I don't know. I know the figures that trademark owners say they will incur, and I think it's a very important issue, I think ICANN's taking it – the whole ICANN community is taking it very seriously in working over a period of 18 months in developing and then enhancing trademark protections.

Heather Dryden: If there are no additional comments on new gTLDs, I'll give the floor to – I'm sorry, on trademark, I'll give the floor to the United States, you've been waiting.

Suzanne Sene: Thank you, Heather.   Suzanne Sene, United States. I just really wanted to kind of go to a threshold issue. First, let me thank you again, Kurt, it's always useful to have you walk us through changes in the new text, especially when it hasn't been out for very long and it's certainly challenging for us. It's still under review in Washington, and I'm pretty convinced my colleagues around the table have a lot of colleagues in national capitals still trying to work their way through the document.

So it's very useful to have your overview of how this version actually does meet concerns, or the needs, or the problems that have been identified by the GAC, and I think it's encouraging that you have such an optimistic assessment that the new version actually does address a lot of, if not all, of the GAC's concerns. What I'd like to actually make a pitch for, it was contained in the most recent GAC letter, and in the very recent NTIA letter, which is it would be extremely helpful for this analysis that you have verbally shared with us to be actually provided to the community, not just to the GAC in written form, because that would go a very long way to clarifying for the entire community what the rationale is, on what basis have you determined, let's take any one of them, that the IP protections are sufficient?

On what basis have you determined that the economic studies, especially the most recent one; I have a question there, how are the results of that study recently posted, going to influence changes to this so-called final version of the applicant guidebook? So all due

respect, and again, I'm very encouraged by your optimistic overview, but I think once it could be committed to writing, so there is a very, very clear expression of the rationale behind each and every change, or each and every decision. Vertical integration, that's another example I think, where there isn't a very clear articulated rationale.

So I would like to make that overarching point, because it is – and to reinforce that as an outstanding request from the GAC. And just to flag a few other points that I think are interrelated. On root scalability, the GAC did ask if you have an intention to introduce a monitoring capability, and I think in the most recent letter from Peter Dengate Thrush, I'm assuming that's from Peter and/or the Board, and/or ICANN, we're not entirely sure how to understand it. But let's say the latest ICANN response, indicates that the staff has been instructed to work on a model, but there's not a lot of detail in the letter as to what that model looks like. So right now you're saying you're ready to roll with about 1000, and yet the economic study, the version that was issued right before Brussels, suggested there be a measured rollout of new gTLDs.

I don't know how my colleagues might define the word measured, but I'm not sure measured equals 1000. I confess, I don't know how to match up the number and the term. So again, having the rationale in writing, as to how all of this fits together and how you have picked up the different inputs, and not just from GAC, but from other parts of the community. One other issue that we have not spent a lot of time here, and I know we're running out of time,

CARTAGENA
DE INDIAS

EN

so Heather, I don't want to take too much more, obviously the objections issue remains an outstanding issue, and that clearly needs to be addressed in a lot more detail.

And mitigating malicious conduct, I think that also remains an outstanding issue, without a whole lot of detail as to how the concerns that have been expressed, not only by the GAC but by other parts of the community; but just speaking for the GAC, our bottom line concern is ensuring that the harms to consumers can be mitigated. So I appreciate, again, this sort of optimistic overview, but simply note we have an outstanding set of recommendations from our law enforcement communities around this table for some very concrete proposals, and I think that remains outstanding with no formal response as yet as to how those proposals are being addressed.

And if I could just flag a concern that certainly has been shared with my agency, is that the current compliance effort seems to have been hit hard in terms of staff and budget resources. So again, contract compliance is currently a problem, and I think you can appreciate then the concern that if you ratchet up to 1000 new top level domains, can the compliance program meet the demands of dealing with malicious conduct, with 100 new top level domains? I think I will leave it at that, I hope I've been clear, but I think having your personal opinion or your verbal overview is, of course, very helpful, but I just would restate the outstanding request that the rationale be formally provided for each and every decision. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz: So just in response to a couple of – your comments are very well taken, and they should be – those considerations should be addressed before the new gTLDs process is launched. I want to point out we published this version of the guidebook earlier than any other version of the guidebook. A few days in advance of the GAC 15 working day requirement to consider them, but I understand that it is a lot of material.

I'd ask GAC members to read the public comment analyses that associate each version of the guidebook that for each change in the guidebook, or each not change as a result of public comment, attempt to describe why changes are made or not made and why changes are made, and those were updated in response to – even after the – they weren't released until the guidebook was released because they were updated after the Trondheim Board resolutions, for example, in order to reflect the Board thinking in those.

We also publish Board papers now and other rationale. I think we could go back and take all of those comment analysis through the five versions of the guidebook and two sets of excerpts and try to synthesize that into a document, but the thinking and rationale is behind there. With regard to root scaling, 1000 TLDs does sound like a lot, even to me, the expected rate is really much less than that. It's about 200 or 250 TLDs a year. To somebody running TLDs, that's a big number, but to a root zone, and people who operate the root zone, that's not a big number. So if we talk about measured, with regard to root zone scaling, that's certainly thought

to be a pretty small number, and you're going to have Suzanne Wolf and others come in and talk about that. But when she or Steve Proctor talk about monitoring mechanisms, they're really talking about things you're measuring almost with a calendar rather than a stopwatch.

The sorts of monitoring mechanisms that will have to be implemented, you know, are not complex. This is –even at 200 or 300 or even 1000, it's such a slow moving growth, to something like the root zone, that the monitoring mechanisms aren't complex. With regard to objections, you know we're really interested in hearing what the GAC has to say, especially with the objection formerly known as morality and public order. We had a consultation session with the Working Group, there was some uncertainty as to what the specific recommendations were. We sent a set of clarifying questions to that Working Group to try to ascertain what the role of – the specific role of the GAC might be, going forward, or ALAC or the Board, so we want to make sure we get that straight. And then with regard to malicious conduct, we can address that.

We convene sessions of law enforcement, the anti-phishing Working Group, the RISG first. That's how those solutions that are in place in the guidebook have been developed. Are we done? We'll never be done. We want to continue to hear and continue to implement increased protections from malicious conduct. There's some in this new version of the guidebook. We continue to work on other concrete ones, and as other concrete suggestions become

available, we want to continue to implement those to try and stay one step ahead. And then finally, for compliance, I agree with you, and there are concrete plans for augmenting compliance, the budget is increased, some people can argue the rate of increase isn't as high as it should be, which it could be a decrease, but it's really a net increase, and the statistics, if you look at the statistics, the number accredited registrars are up, the number of enforcement actions are way up, and there's a concrete operational plan in place for increasing compliance, registry liaison, IANA, all the ICANN functions in anticipation of the new gTLDs program.

So Suzanne, you asked some great complex questions that can't be answered in a short back and forth period, but I just wanted to say something to indicate they are within our contemplation and we agree that they're important.

Heather Dryden: Thank you for that, Kurt. I know that Denmark is asking for the floor, and then we have Italy and Norway. And then I think we need to – and EU Commission, and then we need to conclude this portion because I know Kurt is expected at the Board meeting. So please go ahead, Denmark.

Julia Kahan-Czarny: Thank you, it's Julia Kahan from Denmark. Firstly, thank you for your presentation and overview. With regard to your initial comments about the title of the document, we have an issue of the whole process, because on the website, and as you explained, the Board might or might not take a decision on Friday on this

CARTAGENA
DE INDIAS

document, and the deadline, as I remember, is on the 10th as well, which is the same day as the Board might take a decision.

And so I wonder how this will work, especially we think that the Board really should take time to properly review all the comments posted during this period, which is also very short, and very limited for our consultations at local authorities and with local interests and stake-holders back home. But this actually also feeds into just one example, that there are many issues that are still not clarified, whether community based applications or whether it's a geo-TLD and these kind of jurisdictional issues as well; when they're not clarified, what's the rationale behind this process or these deadlines? Thank you.

Kurt Pritz: I think that's a very important question, there's two answers that I have off the top of my head. One was what is a mechanism to getting to a final guidebook that the Board could consider, so taking comments up to the moment of consideration, like the ICANN budget is, is one of them. We will be summarizing comments as they come in, for the Board, so there's one addition of comments already, there'll be another one available tomorrow for the Board, and one before consideration. So the Board will have available to it recent comments, the most recent comments. If those comments go to this isn't enough time, or the issues are more serious, then the Board would take that into account too, that more time is required.

Julia Kahan:	Okay, thank you for that, because we are drafting a response and hopefully it will come before the tenth, but it's very tight.

Heather Dryden:	Kurt apparently needs to get to the Board meeting right away, however, Karen will remain to answer questions. Thank you Karen, and thank you Kurt for being here today. I'm sure we'll speak again before the end of the week. Alright, so after Denmark we have Italy.

Stefano Trumpy:	Okay, thank you. Two very brief observations, the first one is on the process that we have in front of us, that is a process for a free application for new gTLDs. This means as many as the market will be able to promote, or to present. So this is a typical program as more studies are going on, and I followed with intentions and the explanation that the complexity of the problem increases, so the real point is, in the end, if ICANN will be able to provide to us the assurances that this analysis is satisfactorily conducted, and the process can go on. Otherwise this process could be endless because also different interests of different stake-holders could conduct a long way of further studies. This is a general comment.
	The second one is regarding the root scaling report, and this is certainly if the final number will be maximum of 1000 per year, this never will mean that there will be 1000 of new gTLDs per year, and since the last meeting ICANN introduced the concept of the batches that may be operated and inserted per year. Also at 250 per year, can you imagine that ICANN will be able to sign 250 contracts in one working day in one year? So I see that the process

EN

will be more slow than potentially, also for administrative reasons conducted by ICANN, and initially if you remember, the ISOC report on root scaling was sort of a sentence that was weighted by the community to know how many new gTLDs can be introduced per year, and initially someone said 10,000 or enormous numbers, and then part of the security and stability committee also with the support of the root scaling group started just going down, even drastically, because it is not so clear that the root server system may resolve all the problems including DNSsec, including new IDNs and so on.

So now, at the least, this is not longer appropriate, so we may conclude that when they administer the consideration of ICANN from one side and the process and the root scaling capability, this is no longer a problem. At least this is completed, is my input.

Heather Dryden: Thank you for that, Italy. We have Norway next.

Ornulf Storm: Yes, thank you. Just a general comment and I certainly won't ask the ICANN staff to answer the question, so my point is just regarding this letter we received on the 23rd of November from Peter, and I think we can ask Peter this question, but I sensed a little bit – how to put it? – not the friendliest tone in his manner towards the GAC, and the letter's also highlighted some important issues which have also been pointed out by the accountability and transparency Review Team regarding when and how GAC interact with the pdp, the policy when they're coming into this process. So

CARTAGENA
DE INDIAS

that is probably something to ask Peter about and maybe something for GAC to discuss further. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Thank you for that, Norway. We have next the EU Commission.

William Dee: Thank you, I can save time, actually, because there was a point already raised by Denmark, which has been mentioned. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Okay. Are there any additional comments at this time? I don't see any requests for the floor. Okay, well we have about 10 or 15 minutes before Avri Doria comes to update the GAC on the work being conducted in relation to applicants that need additional need or support, so we may have a brief discussion then on that topic a bit further. In the interim then, how should we make use of this time? Should we discuss maybe, some of the issues that have been raised in terms of the process and not necessarily get into a substantive discussion?

And then as I say, when Avri arrives, we can return to that particular topic, and then I think we're due for a coffee break. Alright. So in terms of process, a number of points were made, in terms of understanding what is the meaning of a draft applicant guidebook that's now called final. Kurt did update us a bit on that and did respond to Denmark's question. Is that sufficiently clear? Is this of concern more broadly among colleagues here, how the timing of that works? Sweden?

Maria Häll: Thank you, it's Maria from Sweden here. I very much want to agree with what Julia from Denmark is saying, that is actually a discussion we have had back in Sweden, the government together with our reference group, concerning internet governance issues, and of course it's been very much in our agenda in Sweden in front of this ICANN/GAC meeting, and one of the things that we absolutely talked about is how this process, this working plan of this applicant guidebook, and also what Julia also said, actually the calling it the final document, means that actually how much changes could be made in other versions, or actually having the final document kind of gives feeling that there's going to be no other version in the future.

So we are very much concerned, and what I want to point out is it's not only the Swedish government, it's also actually the internet community in Sweden having severe problems with this process, I have to say so. So thank you, Julia, I really want to echo what you were saying. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: EU Commission, please.

William Dee: Thank you, yes. I think you picked on an important point for us to reflect on actually, and as I said, Denmark raised the question I had. Kurt's opening comments actually, on the reason behind giving it that title, the draft final means that it's available for the Board to adopt, which in turn, I think implies that the staff think that all the major problems have been solved, otherwise I presume they wouldn't put it in front of the Board to have it solved. Very

recently we've had a letter from the Chairman of the Board giving response to the GAC concerns on recent versions of the dag.

I think we should avoid, therefore, giving the impression to the Board before Friday, given the possibility that they may adopt on Friday, that we're happy with that response. That's purely because we haven't discussed it, in the GAC yet. We've had a chance to have an exchange with Kurt today, but I get the sense that many GAC members still feel there are substantive issues outstanding that need resolving, and we are entering a week where there's a possibility the Board may make a decision on Friday to proceed, based on the draft applicant guidebook, which we may feel doesn't yet resolve all of the public policies we raised, and if that's the case, I think we need to signal that to the Board, before they make that decision. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Thank you for that, next I have Norway and then Germany.

Ornulf Storm: Yes, thank you Heather. It goes in the same line as the European Commission and also with reference to our last letter to the Board where we indicate to ICANN that we will make best efforts to at least preliminary comments here in Cartagena, but we indicated so of course that raises the question are we going to make our final comments here, and I think that's something that we need to now make sure, that the ICANN Board understands that we want to have the possibility to make more comments. Thanks.

Heather Dryden: Okay, thank you for that. Germany?

Hubert Schoettner: Yes, thank you. From our point, I think we are, as you know, quite supportive for introducing new gTLDs in general. We think it is a good idea, and we tried also to foster this discussion, but having that said, we see especially after the last letters that there are a big number of issues that are not solved, and frankly I cannot speak only on behalf of me, but on the behalf of our ministry, I have to interact with various colleagues and that's exactly the question of process. I cannot decide or make decision or accept something regarding trademark issues, because I'm not a trademark specialist. I'm responsible more for tele-communications side.

These are issues we have on the trademark side to have to also they have to explain the difficulties and the discussions, because if it comes to technical question, it's also a very challenging discussion. Another issue I want to mention is that we have on the other side, groups of the government, cities, our federal states that are now confronted with applications and they also want to know what is at stake? What is discussion? How is this sentence to be interpreted? I do not understand the objection process. What is about? And all this more detailed questions which I think is a bit difficult to discuss here in GAC, but they need to be solved, and we need some kind of forum where we can express these detailed questions and just understanding a bit more about the process. It's more technical question, and having said that, I think there's quite a lot of work to be done. Thank you.

EN

Heather Dryden: Thank you for that Germany. Did anyone else want to comment on this? Please, United States.

Suzanne Sene: Thank you, Heather. Actually I think your emphasis on process is really helpful and maybe this – we should start to contemplate some of the points we want to take up with the Board and the Joint GAC/Board exchange, and one of them would be in the event you do determine to approve this text on Friday, because Kurt made it clear that that is a possibility, then maybe we need to ask them to please outline for us how they intend to proceed in consistent with the by-laws provision, that in the event the GAC has offered advice, and the Board does not feel it can accept it, my understanding is that the first step in that process is the Board comes to the GAC to seek to resolve the differences. So that is a slightly – that goes beyond what we're seeing in the exchanges of letters, where actually we're being informed, either by Kurt here and I think Norway has noted this in a slightly more positive tone, and then in letters in writing, in a slightly more dismissive tone, if you will, that there are areas of disagreement.

Certainly the by-laws provide for the Board to have that leeway, that flexibility in saying "well, we disagree with you." But there is a step that hasn't yet been taken, and perhaps we need to more formally ask how that step will be taken, and in what timeline. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Kenya, please.

CARTAGENA DE INDIAS

EN

Alice Munyua: Thank you, I'd like to agree with all my colleagues regarding this important issue of process and timelines, and particularly agree that we do need to ask the Board to provide us with a written more specific input into how not just the GAC's advice, but all other stake-holders, and whether we can be able to trace our input throughout this – especially this gTLD process, and not just the gTLD process, but other pdp related processes as well. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Thank you for that, Kenya. Are there any other inputs on this particular topic? In terms of other issues that were raised, I believe it was the United States that wanted to make the point about providing the rationale for decisions taken, and being explicit about whether the Board believes it has accepted or rejected advice that we may have given to them. Are there colleagues around the table that would like to comment on that particular point? I think Kenya has related it to a broader issue of the treatment of GAC advice, regardless of whether we're talking about new gTLDs or not. So nevertheless, we may wish to keep that in mind. But Denmark, please.

Julia Kahan: Thank you, I would just like to say that I think it's very important that we have the rationale for the decision made or not made. So I support what has just been said about this, to take this up with the Board. Thanks.

Heather Dryden: Thank you for that. Alright. Italy.

EN

Stefano Trumpy: The question of the decision about GAC advice, we discuss it here in the GAC many times, about what we consider a GAC advice, and also the view upon accountability and transparency has produced work and collaborated about that. I think that in the interaction with the Board, we should in the joint Working Group try to evaluate –for this difficult process that is new gTLDs, because normally speaking, GAC advice is the result of new position and then rather big, or not very specific on what should be implemented.

Then maybe what is missing is the fact that ICANN Board or ICANN staff with the Board should interpret how to implement this advice, and then to explain with some details about implementation problems and also the range of possibilities that are in front of any decisions. So this has to be improved as a process and this also something that the review panel is recommending to ICANN and to the GAC together. So since the new gTLDs is such an important asset, let's say, of ICANN, we should take this as a very crucial exercise.

Heather Dryden: Thank you. Okay, I don't see Avri in the room, so what I propose is we have a break now, and we convene in 30 minutes and hopefully she will be here. If not, let's continue with our conclusion, at least for this afternoon, on this topic, and then we will discuss the accountability and transparency Review Team recommendations. Okay? Alright, let's have a break, thanks.