COPENHAGEN – Joint Meeting: GAC & GNSO
Sunday, March 12, 2017 – 15:15 to 16:45 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Please take your seats. And, please, colleagues from the GNSO, join us here. Sit down.

Please take your seats.

Okay. Thanks for our colleagues -- thanks to our colleagues to the GNSO for joining us and for finding the room. We had the same -- I had the same problem Saturday morning finding your room where we had the discussion.

So we have, actually, this time, at least in number of bullets, slightly less heavy agenda. That doesn't mean that the bullets, per se, are not heavy in terms of workload or issues that they comprise. So let's immediately start.

Of course, one of the issues of key interest for the GNSO, but also for us, is the work on the subsequent rounds. And I think we'll hear a few words on where you are with the different work stream on looking into preparing subsequent round. And, of course, including assessing lessons learned from the first round.

So thank you.

Maybe present yourself, because not everybody -- we have some new people, and not everybody may know you.

JAMES BLADEL: Thank you, Thomas. And thank you for welcoming us on the GNSO and the GNSO Council. Congratulations on your announcement, as we mentioned earlier, from all of us. We're selfishly, of course, going to miss you here.   But we understand your duties are expanding significantly.

And I believe that -- and so, for those who haven't met me, my name is James Bladel. I'm chair of the GNSO. We have right here Carlos. Raise your hand, please. Carlos is the GNSO liaison to the GAC. And that is, essentially, a position that was created as a result of our consultations to help our group stay more informed and coordinated in our work.

Just taking her seat now is Donna Austin, who is the vice chair for contracted parties in the GNSO, that is registries and registrars.

And beyond Carlos is Heather Forrest, who is the vice chair for non-contracted parties in the GNSO. That's commercial and non commercial stakeholders.

And Avri Doria is at the far end of the table. She is actually going to speak to the first bullet point along with Paul. Do I see Paul in the room? It's a big room, so I may have missed him. Hey, there's Paul. Fantastic. Paul McGrady, who volunteered to speak to this.

I just want to make sure it's referred to as subsequent rounds. We've been calling it subsequent procedures. I only say that because you may hear the term "subpro," which is not a lower level of basketball or baseball. It actually refers to subsequent procedures, which is the PDP that is working to address some of the topics associated with new gTLDs.

So, with that, I would welcome either Avri or Paul to speak to some of the bullets that we outlined for subsequent rounds.

AVRI DORIA: I spoke to you all about this yesterday. But the agenda was put forward sort of before speaking to you all yesterday. And one of the main concerns that the GNSO had that we spoke about yesterday was indeed the how do we cooperate? And we talked a lot yesterday about where we were in the project between community comment 1, community comment 2, which we've already sent to you. And we'll be sending the final one after these meetings.

We talked yesterday about the great participation we're getting from many of the GAC members in our group and how we hoped there would be some more. And, in fact, a couple of you gave me cards saying, "Add me to the list. I want to be there for this discussion. That discussion."

One of the things we neglected to mention yesterday is the fact that, for people who are only interested in one topic, like when we discuss applicant support or when we discuss that, those topics are

announced often several weeks in advance that "Our schedule is -- ," "We will discuss the following subject on..." a particular date.

So someone that's only interested in that topic can arrange to just sit in on those calls.

Again, want people to be involved, know that it can be a burden being involved as much as some of us are involved and, therefore, want to make it possible.

And I think I've communicated before with some of the -- you know, folks that are participating about what our schedule is to make sure that the GAC has that schedule available.

So part of it, though, is it still feels to me that we're still sort of working our way through to how we work together. We're feeling our way. We're participating in each other's sessions. I was here yesterday. I'm here a little bit today. You're going to be stuck seeing me again on Tuesday and, after you've discussed this, so that we have a lot of chances to talk. Many of you are participating.

But still want to make sure that any of these issues that may be problematic are well-discussed before we get to the end so that they don't become a end-of-process problem. And so I think that's why the topic is on the GNSO's agenda for its talk with you.

So it isn't just Jeff and I as the co-chairs of the group, but so that the issue is actually raised to a, you know, SO and AC relationship issue. So that's my first bit. Paul, who is the liaison between the PDP and the

GNSO also had some comments that he wanted to make. And he's over there. So I'll pass the microphone to him.

PAUL McGRADY: Thank you. Paul McGrady. Just a brief comment that one of the specific aspects that are being looked at now are the contractual aspects found in the Applicant Guidebook from round 1. Among others, the terms and conditions from round 1 of the AGB are under review as some believe they contain provisions that are, perhaps, extremely one-sided, perhaps, in favor of ICANN the corporation at the expense of ICANN the community and new gTLD applicants in general. So that is under some well thought through and intense discussion. And, as Avri mentioned, we are here to invite you to participate in that process and to let us have your thoughts at this early stage so that, as those develop, we end up with a product that the entire community can live with and can be happy with. Thank you.

JAMES BLADEL: So any questions or discussion items from your side?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: I think that does not go to me, in particular, but actually to everybody here. So yeah. Comments or questions of outcome on what you've heard about the subsequent round?

I see Iran and Indonesia and Brazil. Iran, please.

IRAN:	Thank you very much, GNSO colleagues, PDP group, liaison.

I think the participation of GAC in the PDP currently is about aggregate of 1 1/2%. Aggregate.

And I think it is not sufficient. We encourage again our GAC colleagues to actively participate.

But I have a question about the parallel approach that yesterday mentioned by Avri.

That, in order not to wait two or three years to the completion of this activity, the second round, in one way or the other, could be started or is being started or could be started in parallel for those cases that does not require to be waited or are waiting for the completion of the work.

I'm not very clear about that. Whether I heard it properly, whether I misunderstood that and I don't know all the consequence of that. And who is making this judgment and how the judgment is made and what criteria -- that the case in parallel process does not have any impact or any link with the completion of the entire process.

This is something very, very important. And I would like to -- if possible, have some clarification on that. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, okay.

So let me try and explain the statement I made yesterday. First of all, when we're talking about the parallel, we're only talking about the policy development process, not the start of any subsequent rounds.

So just to make sure that that point was clear.

And so we've looked at the charters of the parallel efforts of the CCT, of the rights protection mechanisms and such and the work that they're doing.

And, basically, any time we've had an issue that related to one of those, it's, basically, that issue is on hold until we get their report.

Now, we may talk about it a little bit when we get their draft report so that we can start situating, perhaps asking questions.

In terms of the linking of everything together, the tying, there will be one final set of recommendations. So, if you looked at it as an engineering thing -- and I mentioned this yesterday -- there's an end-to-end dependency. Nothing can end until they've all ended and we have a final report that is, indeed, a coherent report that gets the ICANN consensus of the PDP working group.

So that's pretty much the way of making sure that everything ties together. Nothing ends before everything has come together at the end. We may certainly have a lot of things that we've formed a tentative consensus on that we will have a consensus on many of the issues. But, still, we will have to put the whole package together and get an overall consensus that, yes, we've got a package of

recommendations that we want to send forward. So I hope that I've managed to explain what I was talking about yesterday slightly better.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Avri, Ashwin, Indonesia.

INDONESIA: Thank you. First of all, thank you for you coming here. Because I think many -- the problem of geographic top-level domain and geographic names and so on has so many concerns in the GAC. From this morning we're talking about several presentations on how to protect names and so on.

But what kind of PDP and perhaps results that you can use to protect the concerns of many countries? For example, how will you view the use of names like with the -- sensitive to some countries, for example. Last time we had the problem of geographic names.

We also have the problem of religious names like .ISLAM, .HILAL, and so on. We also have the problem of the use of protection of international IGO names, whether it is dot (indiscernible) whatever.

And also the fact that those kind of names can -- the sensitivity of every name can change from place to place and from time to time. So a particular name that's okay today might not be acceptable in two or three years' time. How can we accommodate this series of problem, not also mentioning the use of the gTLD geographic names and the

second -- sorry -- the use of country code names for the second level domain.

For example, .ID.US or .ID.EU, it doesn't mean that Indonesia is part of EU or Indonesia is part of U.S. Those kinds of things may give a wrong impression. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. Let me try again.

And, please, Paul, or any of my more senior GNSO colleagues, please jump in and correct me.

There's several different topics in the question that you've asked, as mentioned yesterday, in terms of the country and territory names, both at the top and second layer, level.

We're going to be having the webinar that we talked about and, hopefully that joint session that brings together the GAC, the ALAC, ccNSO, GNSO, in Johannesburg to, basically, try and talk about these things in common.

The webinar will be to sort of try and get us all in the same context to have the same sort of framework for the discussion. And then in Johannesburg to try and really talk about those issues, both at the top and second layer.

So at the moment we're -- only thing we're doing on those is planning for those discussions.

In terms of the -- the sensitive names, the reserve names, as you will, that will be part of the work that we're doing in some of our subteams. We will be talking about reserve names. We will be taking into account all of the reserve names, you know, discussions that we had before, the issues that came up during the previous round. You know, so -- and, hopefully, we'll have participation. And we've got your inputs on the sensitive names. And we can see what happened in terms of applications.

And, of course, at the moment, we haven't done anything to change. We're talking about the objection procedures.

You know, we went into the last round with a notion that objection procedures were enough and we didn't need reserve lists. We got disabused of that notion quite quickly and convinced that, no, we do need certain lists of reserve names. Certainly, the Board made a decision on that, et cetera. So we'll be looking at lists of reserve names.

But there will still be objection procedures if there's a reserve name that wasn't thought of.

So I expect that that -- now, what to do about a name that's not a problem today but becomes a problem sometime in the future is one I haven't thought of yet.

And I don't know if anyone else can deal with it. Because a name that is not a problem today that is then utilized is put in the root or put at

the second level and then someday is problematic. I don't know if there's someone else that can help me with that one.

And then the IGO, INGO names is also part of another process that's ongoing. So we're not touching that one until it gets resolved elsewhere with the work that's already being done between the GNSO and the GAC.

JAMES BLADEL: Donna and then Paul.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, James. And thanks, Avri. Donna Austin.

So this is kind of an observation, if I go back in time to when geographic names was discussed under the 2012 round of new gTLDs.

I was in the session yesterday when Avri and Jeff were speaking with the GAC. And the Canadian representative asked the question about to what extent will the GAC's previous advice be taken into account by the PDP working group?

And just one of the things that I want to mention on the, you know, geographic names and sensitive strings. That there was a lot of discussion around that that led up to, you know, what was in the guidebook and the requirements for 2012.

And I think the sensitive strings -- I think the GAC had GAC principles on new gTLDs. And I think it was principle 2.7 or something.

So I think -- you know, I don't know how the PDP is actually handling this. But I think something to bear in mind for the GAC, perhaps, is, you know, to the reference that Canadian GAC representative had yesterday, you know, to what extent does the advice still stand, I guess, that you provided on geographic names that led to the protections that were actually in the guidebook for 2012? And, if -- and, if it's not holding, then what's the rationale for opening that up again? Because I -- you know, there's a lot of stuff that's probably groundhog day for many of us because these discussions were had eight years ago.

But I think it would be good to understand, from a GAC perspective, if you're going to open up these discussions again, on what basis is that? And why doesn't the advice from previous rounds still hold?

Thanks, Thomas.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Donna. Maybe if I may quickly jump in. This is a very good point also to bring to our attention.

Basically, normally, the channel of rule is that advice stands until it's changed or modified or further developed. But I think we also have learned a few things since then. And there may be views that have different difference since then. But we will -- unless something else comes up that replaces an existing advice, normally, the general rule is that advice stands. But, of course, we will review all of this as well in the roundup to the next round.

AVRI DORIA: And I wanted to also indicate that where we're starting from is the existing policy and the application guidebook and all the amendments that were made to it.

So we're not starting from ground zero. We're starting from that.

So what we'll need to look at is what we eventually ended up with, to what degree does it actually meet the principles and guidelines? And are there places where it still doesn't? And those we have to deal with. But it's not like we're throwing everything away that was done in the previous round that came out of the negotiations that the GAC had with the Board and such. And various issues were resolved in those discussions. That discussion -- you know, that stuff is the base that we're working from.

So, if something changes there, there needs to be good reason for it. And there will need to be discussions with GAC and everybody else about any of those changes.

JAMES BLADEL: Paul.

PAUL McGRADY: Donna asked it better, and Thomas answered it better. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:	The next on the list I have is Brazil and then -- oh, is this directly referring to this? Okay. Then let's take Peru first and then Brazil.
PERU:	Excuse me. I would like to know why is your starting point the old Applicant Guidebook and not the results of the working group, the cross community working group on this same issue, for example?
AVRI DORIA:	Okay. Our charter, the way it was basically, to start with what we did and then all of those other materials are part of the original input materials. So any of the output we've gotten from various reviews and other are also part of the starting material. There's a very large amount of starting material that we've got. But the base that we're building on is the -- the program that exists. It's the way the original process was written was this -- this first -- not this first, but this round needs to be reviewed before it can continue, but the presumption is that it continues. And so now we're in that halting point of reviewing everything that was done, taking into account all of the other major reviews and input, putting it together, and going on from there.
JAMES BLADEL:	Heather, you also wanted to respond?
HEATHER FORREST:	Thanks, James. Heather Forrest. Just to follow up on the comment -- or the response that Avri has just provided, when the PDP working

group charter was established it made quite clear that the starting point was the existing Applicant Guidebook and to the extent that provisions were not changed, then it would be assumed that that guidebook would continue, let's say. So that's the baseline. Added to that all of these other things that have happened since. But in terms of a contractual -- of an application starting point, that -- we have what we left with.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Brazil.

BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to start by thanking the GNSO Council for this meeting. And I'd like to raise three points. First one is that cooperation between GAC and GNSO is very good and welcome. We totally support every effort to build bridges among different groupings and efforts. In the early engagement, especially in regard for PDPs, for example, I think it's very good.

However, that takes me to the second point. The participation of governments and GAC as a group in a PDP development, I think we can be encouraged to participate in discussions and to the extent possible to contribute. And we are very happy to see there are some colleagues like my good friend Kavouss that is totally committed and he's like God, he's everywhere. But I don't think that should be the case for all governments. In the case of my government, would not be in a position to dedicate someone to participate fully, consistently, in

a way that would give us the comfort to know that at the end of the process our views would have adequately been served as an input. And I think that might be the case for many governments.

So I think -- I think this is a welcome development, but that should not replace, let's say, the institutional or appropriate moment in which the GAC input as such should be fed into the process. Be it in the beginning, in some midterm stages, but I think individual participation of GAC members should not replace the input that GAC should insert into the process of development of policies.

And this leads me to the third point, because I think we're now looking at the new gTLD particularly. But I'd like to refer to a decision that was taken by the board last year, just by the end of the Hyderabad meeting, to allow for the registration of two-letter code at second level domain. In our opinion that was a decision that has very serious implications. It touches very deeply on a very delicate balance between GNSO, ccTLDs, countries. It drastically changes the way we have been operating in which there was the understanding that the two-letter country code belongs to the country, and I think there was no education that there had to be limit to the top level part. So we think that was a decision now that we approach the board we were told that was done on the basis of a PDP that was developed by GNSO.

And that leads me, take the three issues together, I think that leads me unfortunately to conclude that the -- the way the system is working is dysfunctional. The GAC was addressing this issue in a very serious way, at least my delegation was addressing this. We were being

consulted and holding rounds of discussion around this issue and how these topics should be addressed. We understand there was an effort on the basis of a PDP that was developed by GNSO, and we fully agree of the legitimacy of the GNSO to have developed the PDP. But my concern and my question is, how the GAC input was fed into this process. How is GAC input -- if was taken to the board and how it -- because it seems that the board just acted on the basis of the GNSO PDP that to my knowledge, and I stand to be corrected, and I'm not too familiar of the process. It doesn't seem that the GAC participation -- so I think cooperation is very good. It is indeed necessary, but unfortunately in that case we -- we're not sure what happened because GAC was following a track on the basis of a long-standing practice that was radically changed with the board decision. This will have serious implications for countries and for ccTLD operators that are still to be -- one of them, for example, is what will be the cost associated if a country or a ccTLD operator wants to register a second-level country domain. We are told that registries are requesting some amount of money. So we fail to see also how public interest is being served by that decision. So there are a number of questions associated to this we'd like to have more clarity. I apologize if we need some information -- if we lost some information. There are so many streams of things going on in ICANN, maybe we have lost something. But we see -- we fail to see that maybe the GAC input or the country's opinion was even considered. I'm not -- you know, I do not know. I'd like to have maybe some clarity. And I think this is important because as we think about the future way of working together, we have done it in other cases here. We should not forget some very recent things that

happened that raised concern so we can maybe make sure that as we move forward we address those issues in an appropriate way. Thank you.

JAMES BLADEL: So I have Donna and than Manal and then Carlos to respond.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks. Donna Austin. So to respond to your question about the PDP, so my understanding from the PDP that was conducted in 2007, the recommendation that was -- there was no reservations to be at second level, so there was no reservation for any two levels -- well, any string at the second level. I think what happened through the process of discussions with the GAC along the way, within the Registry Agreement, in specification 5, there was language there that said that a two-letter code could be released either with the agreement of the government and the ccTLD manager or by approval from ICANN. So what happened -- and I -- I'll put my Registry Stakeholder Group hat on here because to be honest, I was probably one of the protagonists coming from the side, so from the Registry Stakeholder Group side of things. It was our view, and I think Thomas and I had an exchange during a meeting in Buenos Aires on this. There is no rights attributed to a country at the second level of a TLD, just because they happen to be the two letters that match a country code that's on an ISO 31661 list. So from our perspective, we wanted to see some evidence that that actually was the case.

So from the Registry Stakeholder Group perspective, we didn't believe there was any rights, but at the end -- this was a long iterative process. And we -- to be honest, we felt a little bit aggrieved because the GAC kept coming back and back and back with advice on this issue that stopped the implementation of, you know -- within the registry -- within the Registry Agreement it was around measures to avoid confusion, and many of the registry operators actually have, you know, measures in place or policies in place to address that. So we felt a little bit aggrieved that, you know, GAC advice was actually holding off implementation of these because it -- it kept coming and it kept changing. Is we were getting frustrated with that.

So the PDP itself was done some years ago, and the PDP outcome was that there be no reservations at the second level and then through discussions with the GAC in the development of the guidebook and the Registry Agreement, I think there was an agreement reached that, you know, the -- you needed the support of the country and territory, the ccTLD manager and the country, relevant country or territory manager or you just needed approval from the -- from ICANN if you had identified -- if you had measures to avoid confusion.

So we probably have a little bit of a breakdown in communication about what happened, but the -- what the board implemented to move forward is that registry operators do actually have to -- there's two mandatory measures I think that we need to have in place, and if the -- one of those is that if the government has a problem with a country code that's two letters that are being registered at the second level, they can come back to the registry operator and seek some kind

of, you know, investigation into why that is and seek some resolution there.

So there might be some misinformation or miscommunication on what happened, but from the other side being -- you know, working for a registry operator and within the Registry Stakeholder Group, that was kind of our perspective, that we felt we were getting blocked by the GAC, by advice that was changing, and there was never any really legal rights or -- to a country code at the second level. I'm not going to dispute anything for a country code at the top level, but at the second level we don't believe that there's any rights associated to that. So, you know, from our -- from our perspective, it was a long conversation that took two years to resolution, and I know the GAC wasn't necessarily happy with it, but it -- you know, we -- registry operators are operating in good faith, that we, you know, are conscious of what those mean to governments at second level and we do have -- we do have to provide measures to avoid confusion at the second level, and we do that. Sorry for the long-winded response.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. Just very quickly to confirm what my colleague from Brazil mentioned about the pricing, just to share the prices we received when we asked about being delegated the two-letter code under some top-level domains, it was in the range between $5,000 and $10,000, which I believe are by far more than what the governments have expected. But the renewal is for $30. The renewal. But this is the first-time registration. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Just, I have Norway, Iran, Peru, Portugal, and Brazil. Is everybody wanting to speak on this one or was Norway on something else? Okay. I will not forget you, Norway. If I do, please shout. All the others, one minute each because this is a thing we have discussed -- and Carlos, this is something that we have discussed for quite a long time, so we know that there are differences of view on this. So let's try and be brief and not repeat everything that we have said in the past here. So maybe Carlos was waiting for quite some time, and then I go through the GAC people's list. Thank you.

CARLOS RUIZ GUTIERREZ: Thank you, Thomas. Just to answer the first two points that Ambassador Fonseca raised, the idea of participation of the GAC is clearly focused on giving the GAC an opportunity, an early opportunity, to revise the charter of the PDPs and flag public interest issues. I would love to have Kavouss in any working group, of course, but I think we -- we had a good experience with three exercises on PDP and we expected the GAC just to use a very short period of time, concentrate, take a look at the charter, and if they want to put a red flag, we will continue briefing you on that. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I have Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Thomas. I seek your serious indulgence not to rush and say that one minute. This is not a one-minute issue. I disagree totally with Donna. Her interpretation of the situation is tacit agreement. If you don't reply, that means you agree. It is not the case. The culture of government is not this. Some people may say yes, some people may no. We are far from 2007. We have raised our questions, and I don't think that the ICANN should take himself or herself out of this question. And I have the understanding that ICANN board has been biased by the GNSO by saying that we don't intervene anymore, we leave it to the registries to take care of this action. We don't agree with that. We have serious concerns. Not all of us, but most of us. And I fully agree with the distinguished ambassador and Egypt and many other people. This issue has not been resolved. And I don't understand that GNSO -- why she is saying that she is frustrated. We are frustrated of the inaction which has been taken. Our interest is dearly violated. So I don't agree with that, and we raise this question. And we don't want that this question be absolved. So this is an important issue, and the board is responsible under the request of the distinguished chair of the GAC to raise this issue with the board and held responsible those people that totally ignore the views of some GAC member that they are really and seriously concerned about this very important question. I disagree with the conclusion of GNSO on this matter. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Iran.

Peru.

PERU: Okay. I will speak in Spanish.

In most GAC member countries, and also for most countries that are not GAC members, the notion of belonging in terms of geo names and their country codes is a fundamental notion. This is different in a small handful of countries on a global scale. And those countries are not the majority.

So please, I would like you to shed some light on this and explain why you think that using a country code at a certain level can be admitted and that cannot be the case at another level.

Do you believe that there is a difference in terms of affections and belongings regarding where the reference to a country is placed? We are speaking about a reference that has to do with a country's identity, and you believe that by placing that reference either on the first or second level, that changes totally. That changes my relationship with those initials completely. And that is not the case. That is a commercial view on this matter, and it overlooks the majority worldwide.

So I would like you to tell me which countries in the world or which GAC member countries approve that decision. How many countries are there? What's the percentage? I believe that we have to work in close cooperation with the GNSO. That is, indeed, important. But I do believe that decisions like the ones made by the board do not

contribute to an environment of trust between the GAC, the GNSO, and let alone the board.

Therefore, I would like to support the comments made by my colleagues from Brazil, Iran, Egypt, and I would like you to note that from Peru, I am really willing to work with the GNSO, but I also have serious concerns in terms of the decisions made and the way these decisions are reached.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. We'll take a few more. Please be brief.

Next is Portugal.

PORTUGAL: Well, I'm going to speak in Portuguese.

Thank you very much. The usual is that the governments had nothing to do with domain names. But why should we think that with so many names, with so many letters, with so many words around the world, why -- why the letters that are not important for us should be sought? Because we are talking about country code TLD. Why should we use these type of words? Because I think consumers could be mistaken. This leads to confusion.

So I do think that some governments are not thinking that this market should have no borders. We cannot imagine of such a market because we are making up a market.

So I'm really surprised. I know that this generates lots of money, and of course we are not against that because we want a strong private sector, but we have to defend public policies as well.

So I think that we're speaking about public policy here. We're speaking about not to lead consumers to confusion. And I think there are lots of words and combination of letters that may be used around the world.

So let's not think only about the country codes.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Portugal.

Looking at the time, I think we know that we have many -- (indiscernible). We have many governments, as you see, that have strong feelings about this. We have expressed this before.

I have -- I will close the list after Brazil, and as you have already spoken, please be brief. Then I have Germany, then I have Singapore.

If we -- I mean, we can continue -- I mean your hands, we can continue to have this discussion on this topic for -- for the rest of the -- of the

session and not talk about the others if this is -- this is what you wish. So think about it.

Okay. Brazil, please.

BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sorry to take the floor again.

Well, I'd like to say my comments should be seen in the light as representative of a government that truly supports a multistakeholder approach and that wants ICANN to improve continuously. And we fully respect the opinion of the registry operators as spelled out. And probably if I were a registry operator, I would have the same feeling and would act likewise.

But we are governments. We have different concern, different sensitivities. And I think the beauty on working on a multistakeholder environment is to take into account the different position, different approaches. And I'm sorry to say that in that case, I think that was not the case.

And I must say it's not the position of all countries. I think if there were to be a poll, some would not be too much concerned about that, others would be concerned. We -- Even in our case, we have -- for example, we are not concerned about the gTLDs associated to brands, for example, br.realtor, br.cocacola; I don't know. That is not concern to us. But if we are refer to a sect or to a concept, I think the association could lead to some sensitivities. For example. br.sucks, we would have a concern about that, or br.hotel or -- I don't know.

So we think there would be -- And I think that's the beauty of working in this environment, to make decision that are informed by people coming from different direction, different concerns. And in that case, unfortunately, I think that do not -- was not the case. And I -- And I must confess, I was -- I don't have too much information on this. I thought it was a new PDP. I learned it was a PDP coming from 2007. But that leads me to then to ask myself why such a decision was taken now by the end of the last year when there was a process, ongoing process in GAC in regard to this.

So I think there are many issues associated to what has taken place, and that should lead us to reflect when we are thinking about working together to devise rules and regulations for the future of our organization.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Germany is next.

GERMANY: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Only a short notice.

During the discussion it was mentioned that there's no legislation on the protection of geographic names. I just want to clarify that we, in Germany, have such a legislation. And according to our laws, names, including geographic names, are protected.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

I have Singapore, Italy, China, Venezuela, and Mexico.

Singapore.

SINGAPORE: Thank you, Chairman.

We would just like to echo what Manal had said. We noted that ICANN Board has approved three mitigation measures, and one of the measures is to tell the governments or ccTLD managers that if you have a concern of your country code names, you register your names during the preregistration period. And we all know that recently there's one registry who sort of acting on behalf of 40 new gTLD -- 40 of new gTLDs. And when we made inquiries, the price they charge is exorbitant. And the reply we got is that they group the country codes into premium range and subpremium range, or whatever range. And the (indiscernible) government has to spend some 40-, $50,000 U.S. to register country codes with the 40, over, new gTLDs. So as a government or ccTLD member, we felt that we are held ransom by the registry.

Now, this is the outcome of what ICANN has come with the mitigation measures. That cannot be the case. We are using public fund just to

register two-letter codes, and we're talking about 40 registry.   How many new TLD is yet to come?

So we would like to suggest that the mitigation measure is not really helpful to help the country manager to register the names. Perhaps the ICANN would like to review this aspect.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

Italy.

ITALY: Thank you, Chair.

 Thanks for the meeting, but I'd like to -- to repeat some important concern for us about the -- just about the way in which the two-character country code second-level domain has been handled.

We believe that the GAC advice was not taken into due account. We believe also that the sense of the GAC advice has never changed.

So we want to reiterate, we have to reiterate the advice due to the continuous change to the procedure made by ICANN.   So in our opinion, it was clear to the board that the sense of the advice was that the government would like to decide on this issue. You can see the board scorecard posted on December 2016 and verify that the board is

aware that there is a GAC consensus that every country should have a say in that issue.

So the Hyderabad resolution, November 2016 and its implementation in December 2016 seems to run counter the advice. It's clear that the GAC advice was not clearly taken into account in that case. And so this is our concern.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Italy.

China.

CHINA: Oh, thank you, Chairman. I'm going to speak in Chinese and I want to use this opportunity to provide my support to all the members of their opinions, including Brazil, Peru, Iran, Singapore, these countries, their opinions.

What I wanted to say is, indeed, as the Chinese government, we have been thinking and considering like some policies developed by GNSO and approved by the board will provide -- will actually cause some difficulties because we have been paying attention to the policies that developed, and we do have concerns. Today, the GNSO's people that came here to interact with us. We're hoping that as GAC members and as an entity, that we're hoping that we can resolve some issues with

the GNSO, especially those issues that concern by the government and the members.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: ...also what -- Was I taking Mexico for Venezuela? Okay. Thank you. Mexico, please. Sorry.

MEXICO: Good evening, everyone. Thank you, Chair, and thank you, the GNSO, for being here. And I would like to speak in Spanish, so if you want to use your headset.

Some of my colleagues have already mentioned something about this issue, and Mexico certainly concurs with all of them.

I would like to be brief, and I would like to emphasize of what the CCT group was mentioning. The TLD that are the most visited are those TLDs with which customers are more familiarized. So some of these measures were taken so as to avoid consumers' confusion. And since -- if we are going to release codes that are related to the country codes, this will not lead to less confusion by consumers.

So I don't know if countries have to register these names so as to protect them. And as Manal was saying, the costs are really very high, with the sole purpose of protecting these country codes or country names.

Many of the governments here have already made comments regarding these measures that have been approved, and we do not

know what has happened to these comments, if they were taken into consideration or not.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Mexico.

There -- For your information, there are many more countries that share the views that we just heard that did not take the floor, and just to see that this is a very sensitive issue to a number -- a large number of countries. I've raised this before. We have some advice from a number of GAC meetings.

We do understand that in the Applicant Guidebook, as you mentioned, it says that a country code can be released either through a consent by the country or the ccTLD or ICANN developing some procedures, blah, blah, blah.

We do also understand now, maybe we did not understand this in 2011 or '12, that there is had either/or is a slight difference to what we have also in spec 5 on the country and territory names where it's only -- the only thing is that they can only be released with the consent of the governments and the ccTLDs and the "or," ICANN can release it under certain conditions option is missing. Maybe given the workload that we were suffering under we missed -- or many GAC members missed that element and did not raise it then, and then realized later in the course that actually the expectations on that "or" part, or if they -- if they had it, the expectation on that "or" part was different from what it had become in the course.

I think it's a long discussion. To what extent there is a right or no right on this, we've had that. What is clear is that is a public-policy issue and it is a matter of public interest. I think this is very obvious listening to the -- to the number that have spoken and to the number that would speak if we had more time.

So the question is what to do with this. And I think a very important point is the one that has made -- been made by Egypt and Singapore. Those mitigation measures, if you calculate this -- if you are extra polite, this proposed fee that governments or ccTLD registries would have to pay, and if you multiply this with the 1200, or whatever, TLDs you have in the root, that makes quite a significant sum year by year, if I understand this correctly, that would need to be paid for those who have strong feelings about this.

So I think it's Singapore's question about whether this is a useful mitigation mechanism or measure is -- I think is a very relevant question. I'll stop here and give the floor to you. Sorry for bumping you with this. But it is, obviously, a very important issue to a very large number of countries. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Thomas. And thanks to everybody who has contributed to this discussion.

I do understand that it is a very sensitive topic for you. And I can tell you that from the other side of the fence it's a very sensitive topic for us as well.

I understand that you've provided a lot of GAC advice on this topic. Probably what you don't -- may not appreciate is that we have also provided many communications to the Board on this topic as well with our perspective.

And I think, you know, at the end of the day, the Board made a decision in Hyderabad trying to balance the different views. So, from the GAC perspective and from -- not only the registry stakeholder group -- and I will make a distinction here that this wasn't discussed by the GNSO Council in any way. But, certainly, the registry stakeholder group was very active in this discussion. I do believe there was a public comment process and that the views of the some of the other stakeholder groups or constituencies within the multistakeholder community were consistent, perhaps, with where the registry stakeholder group was coming down.

So I think, at the end of the day, the Board has heard the GAC advice. And I can't speak for the board; but they've done a balancing, I guess, of you know, what's from the GAC's perspective and what's come from the rest of the community. So I think there was some balancing done.

And, Thomas, not to underestimate that this is very sensitive to the GAC. And I guess that, you know, if there's an opportunity for -- if you want to come and talk to the registry stakeholder group at some point in time and maybe have a discussion about the measures to avoid confusion, you know, I need to go back to the stakeholder group and see if that's something that they would be willing to do. But, you

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Donna. Heather is next.

HEATHER FORREST: Thank you, Thomas. Heather Forrest.

In hearing the many interventions, we noted a number of times when various efforts of the GNSO were, perhaps, conflated and confused. There were efforts -- before the PDP there was a reserve names working group that finished its work in 2007. There were the GNSO recommendations that were published at the end of 2007 which led the development of the guidebook. There were provisions about these topics in the guidebook. There were actions taken by staff since that time.

And I would like to offer -- this is very much impromptu and perhaps the GNSO support staff will throw me dirty looks. But I would like to suggest that, given that there are so many things that have led up to this particular decision that we're talking about now or the current state of affairs, that it might be helpful if we put together a webinar or some sort of a briefing that would help GAC members, particularly those newer to the GAC, understand the process of how we've gotten here.

Because I think we get very nervous when things are attributed to a PDP that didn't come from a PDP, particularly when things came from staff that and didn't come from the GNSO. It might just be helpful.

If you would like, we could follow up and offer some assistance in understanding how we've gotten to where we are in differentiating what came from the GNSO and what didn't. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Heather. I think it's always useful to understand the past in order to understand how we got to some point. Thank you for this offer. And I hope people will make use of it.

In addition, of course, it's also useful to find a way forward. And that is ideally satisfactory to everybody involved.

I'll stop here. And I'll give the floor to Iran. And then I would ask for permission to move to the next issue here, because we do have a few other things on our table and we have something like 30 minutes left.

But I think it was important to give this some space and so that we see how deep this goes, this issue goes. And it's -- it goes through all the regions of the GAC. It's not a question of just some areas. It's really a very large and very diverse group that has strong feelings about this. And I think this has become very clear. So we're happy to hear from you how we got here. And we're also, let's say, yeah, still looking for ways to somehow find a solution that is acceptable to everybody. Iran, and then we will end this issue here. Thank you.

IRAN: Thank you. Thank you very much, Donna. Thank you very much, Heather.

I think, perhaps, there is an impression that GAC member does not understand the situation. I'll help them. I'm sorry to say that, if we have not participated in the ICANN meeting, does not mean that we don't understand. We are very familiar with the case of 98. We have followed that very, very carefully. But we didn't consider that our lack of reply means agreement.

I don't think that -- thank you very much for webinar. But I don't think that helps at all. Issue is much more beyond the webinar.

This is no misunderstanding. There is lack of proper treatment. We understand the situation. You protect your system, and we protect our system. So that is that. There are disagreement, and we have to resolve disagreement.

You don't need to go to the stakeholder registry and so on and so forth. I know what they want to say. They protect because they want to have money. That's all. We protect -- we want to have our (indiscernible.) We want to have our legislation. We want to have our dignity. We want to have many, many things.

I don't think that webinar has helped. However, thank you very much. We attend the webinar, but is not important to resolve the issue. Maybe helpful to pushing forward to your proposal. But we have serious difficulty to accept that. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Just one element that I wanted to bring up with regard to the subsequent round. We just this morning had an information session by the CCT review team about the first draft of the report that we have not -- most of us have not been able to read yet. But we will as soon as we have the time.

And that was just a question that I would have to part of the subsequent round. How are you processing the findings of the draft report into your -- that's a question to Avri. Are you waiting for the final report, or are you already looking at this and taking this into account? Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Avri speaking.

So we had a conversation -- Jeff and I had a conversation with the CCT yesterday where they gave us the recommendations, and we started discussing them.

So we'll start, you know, being aware of them and taking them into account as we move forward. But we will, certainly, be waiting for the final after it's been commented and everything else.

But we've already been informed and are already aware and already taking into account.

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:	This is already great. Thank you. So I hope you can -- the three other issues are probably issues that will take a little less time.
	So one is the famous GAC-GNSO Consultation Group that has issued a final report sometime ago. And we are in the implementation phase of this. So it's just to see where are we with this and what needs to be done. And what are the next and final steps in this regard? Thank you. James.
JAMES BLADEL:	Thank you, Thomas. As you're probably aware, we adopted this consultation group final report and recommendations last time around. And Carlos, I think, can provide an update on the status of where we are as far as implementing those. Obviously, the fact that we have a liaison is part of the implementation. So his existence is one update. But, if you'd like to update on any other aspects of this as well as some potential fodder for future enhancements.
CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:	As long as the chairs of the GAC and GNSO have regular calls like we have had over the last few months, everything is working well. Thank you very much, gentlemen.
CHAIR SCHNEIDER:	Is there any question from the GAC or from anybody else on the consultation? I see Pakistan. Thank you.

PAKISTAN: Thank you, Thomas. And thank you, gTLD and GNSO for the gTLD processes.

From the discussions, particularly, and the new gTLDs programs, it seems that GNSO PDP process needs more improvement. And this improvement maybe enhanced by the consultation with the communities of the world. Many of the countries like our country has 200 million people. And I think more than -- not more than 200 people know about the gTLDs.

So, to enhance the awareness sessions and to take the communities on board to get their feedback in the PDP processes, GNSO should arrange outreach programs in consultation with the GAC members. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Manal.

EGYPT: Thank you. Just to bring to the attention of everyone that the implementation plan was already circulated. And it mentions each recommendation of the consultation group, the proposed implementation steps, and who is responsible for doing what and the expected timing. There are a few things that are already completed. There are other things that are ongoing. And everything is in the implementation plan. And, as you all know, this is an ongoing process. So any time you have any comments, I think we can fine tune and accommodate as we go. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Manal. I think the intervention by Pakistan is probably a little bit more on a broader base, not directly linked to the consultation group but to the -- let's say diversity in the biggest sense of the -- or inclusivity of the ICANN and/or GNSO processes with regard to public comment periods and PDPs and so on. James.

JAMES BLADEL: Okay. I was going to reply to Pakistan.

EGYPT: Just to clarify, I was not intending to reply to what Pakistan said. I was just complementing what Carlos mentioned. Thank you.

JAMES BLADEL: And, by way of reply or response, just a note that the PDP process currently calls for outreach to all SOs and ACs at the beginning of the process. I think, now that we have a couple of things in place and given our experience with some recent issues, we are encouraging that to be more active outreach to members of the GAC either as a whole or individually and also to encourage individual GAC responses to public comments both at the initial public comment and then public comment on the final report. So, you know, essentially, throwing open the welcome mat to any feedback from any country either individually or as the GAC on any active PDP.

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Next I have Switzerland and then Indonesia.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair. And good afternoon to every one of you. Thank you for coming.

On these recommendations, apart from the implementation plan, which I looked at, I was wondering whether, regarding the ongoing PDPs, you had done some outreach to the co-chairs of those PDPs and informed them about the recommendations.   Because some are relevant to them. And some may be applicable in the near future, for instance.   There is a recommendation, recommendation 5, that suggests that, when there is more or less clarity, that there might be a difference of opinion between GAC input and the draft recommendations. Before going to final stages a dialogue should be sought.

So I think it's important that we really trigger that and that we avoid situations where we have final recommendations and we repeat the story we are living through these days. For instance, with the IGOs and so on and so forth.

So I think that, apart from implementation plans, which are very useful, it's important also to really put it to work and to really use these instruments of dialogue and mature contact. Thank you.

JAMES BLADEL: Just that -- and I think we had this discussion yesterday where I wanted to emphasize the singular and unique nature of the IGO issue, the Red Cross issue that's prompted us to have these facilitated discussions.

I think that we are actively seeking input from the GAC and, you know, from individual countries. We are, I think, in the process of encouraging leadership of existing PDPs and future PDPs to seek that out.

But, as far as having a set phase where we have a dialogue on our final recommendations, that is something that we are seeking to actively avoid, creating a new phase of the PDP that currently does not exist that would essentially shift the focus of the policy development work from the PDP to a bilateral or trilateral dialogue. I think we are undertaking that in good faith.

In this particular situation, because of the timing and the age and the fact that it's been going on for so many years, we want to push it forward and break through some of these issues. But I don't, just speaking from the GNSO, I don't believe that there is a desire to see that become a permanent or regular feature as part of the policy development.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Indonesia.

INDONESIA: Thank you, Thomas. Just a short question, actually, to our friends from GNSO and perhaps also to you, yourself, Thomas.

Every country can actually block any Web site they do not want because of the content or whatever.

What my question is: Are you aware of any country in the world that blocked a particular Web site not because of the content but because of the name, the name of the Web site itself? Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: You mean of the string?

INDONESIA: The string of the -- thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Well, I'm not a law enforcement expert. But this so-called DNS blocking, of course, is to some extent, a reality. But I don't think we can go into detail about this. And there's a long discourse about the risks linked to this. But it is being done, at least in some cases, from what I know.

I think Switzerland would like to come back to the reply from James. Switzerland, please, go ahead.

SWITZERLAND: Yes. I think it's important to underline that I think there was a miscommunication. Because I was making reference to one of the common recommendations we agreed in the consultation group. And this recommendation says that it does encourage the GAC and the GNSO to engage in dialogue, either through the regular mechanisms identified or on an ad hoc basis in those instances where there is an obvious difference between the proposed PDP recommendations and GAC input that has been provided.

Such a dialogue could, for example, take place following the publication of the initial report and/or before consideration by the GNSO Council of the final report.

That's what I mean. And that is precisely directed to avoid situations where we have final positions.

But we have ongoing PDPs where unless we make some effort to find common ground, we will end up in that situation. And so my point was, are the co-chairs being alerted that this is a shared recommendation by the GAC and the GNSO that would help us really to avoid ending up in a -- in a lock hash (phonetic) situation.

JAMES BLADEL: So thank you for the clarification. I think it was the linkage with that and the IGO/Red Cross that was part of my confusion and why I heard it incorrectly. I think that that encouragement is occurring and will occur for future as part of not only the dialogue that we have regularly at ICANN meetings but also, I think there is a desire to increase the

frequency and substance of regular communications between the leadership of the GNSO and the GAC intersessionally between ICANN meetings so that we can get further out in front of some of these issues, particularly when we expect that there's going to be divergence between these positions. So thank you for the clarification.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Looking at the course of time, I think we should -- we have -- it's not on the screen now, but there are two more bullet points on our agenda. And from what I noted on -- actually the next one is actually feeding very nicely into the discussion we were just having. It was something like about feeding into the PDPs from the GAC side at an early stage. It's connected to this whole notion of early engagement, if we could have the slide back. But from -- there was the example of the geo names I think was cited in that bullet and -- now it's back. So that -- and we've been starting to discuss this. I think that it would be useful and I think it's -- this is the plan for Johannesburg, that there will be somehow a cross community exchange. And I think it's not necessarily the idea to have bilaterals but actually to have an inclusive discussion about an issue such as geographic names as part of a fact-finding or sensitivity finding mission during a PDP before it's completed as an additional channel for communication. If I get this point right this is -- this is -- the purposes of this is to look into whether this -- and it's actually quite in line with what the recommendation 5 that has been cited but Jorge that looks at it from a GAC point of view. But also that, I think, should not be read as inclusively or exclusively a

GAC bilateral issue but just a channel that we would like to have but that others, of course, can have, too. So I think Avri has already said that the session on geo names is planned, and I would see this as one of the examples where we undertake such more substantive discussions as they are put in this bullet, if I understand this right. So any questions, comments, on this one? I see Iran.

IRAN: Not -- not really to that, but I have a request to the people preparing these questions of 20 page. There are four tracks. We understand that are (indiscernible) -- they are distinctly separated from each other, but not all of the people are interested or possible to reply to all of those. Is it possible to subdivide some of the activities in a particular track into the sub-track in order that attract the attention of the people which are interested in that area? We don't have such resources, enormous resources, that GNSO have. We are very limited in resources, and it would be difficult to answer this 20 page of more than 150 questions. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Iran. I think Avri has already said that it's not necessary to fill in all -- all or to look at all the questions, but your question is slightly different. So you would like to have a little bit more guidance that people actually don't have to go through all the questions in order to find out which questions are relevant, is that the point that you are making?

IRAN: My point is that if we could subdivide, for instance, the track 1 into sub-tracks, that people they look at the title of that sub-track and just read that one. Otherwise, they have to go to all of those questions. Some of the tracks has enormous number of questions. I says if possible. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think now it is clear. Does anybody want to react to that request?

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Thomas. Donna Austin. So obviously I can't speak for the PDP working group, but I think it's a reasonable suggestion that perhaps there are headings that can call out what the specific topic is so that it's easier to find areas of interest. So I think that's a reasonable suggestion, and we can take it back to the PDP working group.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much. Anything more to add or to say linked to the third bullet that we have on the screen? Yes, Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND: Sorry for coming back for a third time, but very shortly. I think the value of such a session or related sessions would be to really prepare them as working sessions. Not as an ad hoc event that only happens

once but really as a session where to ask if it were a normal PDP working group session but with a presence of the rest of the community, allowing in the schedules for the presence of the -- of the rest of the community to really discuss and flesh out difficult issues. Because we have had the -- the experience in some of the previous meetings of cross community sessions, they are interesting, they are informative, but they are not really working sessions where you really arrive at the outcomes. And I think that the value would be to structure them really as working sessions of the PDP and that the outcomes of the discussions really are taken on board in the subsequent work.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. So you say that they should not be nice-to-hear sessions that you take note and then you go back to your silo and continue as you did before, but it should actually be part of the silo, be part of an opened up silo where others are invited in to actually follow the normal course of work, if I understand you right. I think that -- yeah. Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. Thanks, Thomas. Jorge, I think that is the intent of the geo session, that it is a working session and it will be, you know, fed into the PDP working group. So I don't think it's going to be a talk fest. I think we want to get down and get some work done. So I think that's the intent. Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much. United Kingdom.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thanks, and just to add to that, the webinar could serve as a valuable preparatory step to -- first of all, to create awareness of the cross community discussion. But also be the trigger for identifying the questions that need to be addressed with the involvement of all of the community. And I understand the -- the possible date for that for us to note in our diaries is the 25th of April. Yeah. So thanks for that. I think this is a very valuable initiative. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks. I -- I think, you know, moving forward we -- we often hear from the GAC that you don't have the resources to participate in a PDP on a regular basis, so to the extent that this kind of format actually works, and is more useful for the GAC and certainly for PDP working groups in incorporating, you know, GAC participation, not only GAC participation but broader community participation around the topic of a PDP, I think it's -- you know, if it works for the GAC and it's more useful for participation in the PDP, this is a trial, let's see if it works, and see if we can adapt it for other, you know, sensitive topics as well. I shouldn't say sensitive. Topics of common interest.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Donna. And actually that leads nicely to the next bullet point. Probably you did this on purpose, because the next bullet point is exactly about the workload. And we've discussed this before and many times and will not stop raising this because it's -- it's a fundamental challenge that people are not always aware that a GAC representative is not just a GAC representative of his country but has sometimes 5, 10, 15, or even more international institutions and processes on his plate that he or she needs to follow, needs to report, needs to consult, and it's -- there's a limit to the hours a day or a week that an average GAC representative is able physically to spend on ICANN issues. And unfortunately while the economy grows in most countries with moderate rates, the government budgets normally grow negatively with the same rates, i.e., we get more responsibilities but not necessarily more resources, which does not really help us to engage more, although we want. And, of course, whereas CPUs tend to be double as quick in a few months or -- this is not necessarily the case for human beings working in the administration.

To cut the long story short, we have to find -- and thank you very much, Donna, for what you just alluded to. We have to find ways that allow government representatives, and I don't think it's just a problem of government representatives but it's definitely a problem of government representatives to somehow in a most efficient possible way come in at -- at defined points in time, catch up easily, participate in the discussion, and then go back to other work that they have to do and I think we -- we can find better ways than we have had so far to interact in between. And if a session like this I think helps us to do

that, that is exactly what we are seeking because as many times as we say that we all agree that we should be earlier engaged, we will never have 50 GAC representatives as an average participation number in a call of a PDP. That is simply not realistic. It's not because we don't want, but it's simply not realistic. So I think that's the -- the key message behind that fourth bullet. And we need to find ways to somehow reduce the problem to a bearable -- for us a bearable amount. Thank you, James.

JAMES BLADEL: Well, thank you, Thomas. You may be surprised to hear this, but this is something that we also struggle with within the GNSO. Particularly because -- well, like many of the folks in this room, this side of our work is secondary or it's a hobby or it's a, you know, something that we do in our free time when we're not doing our primary jobs with our companies or organizations. It is something that we struggle with, not only in finding participants for PDPs but also in finding leadership for PDPs because the leadership is -- is another order of magnitude of a commitment in terms of time and in some cases travel and workload. A lot of this also causes us to probably overload our support staff, but that's maybe a story for Goran and the board.

We are examining -- and finally, we note that a number of CCWGs or review teams are organizing either in response to some sort of issue or on their own according to the bylaws and that these are covering some of the same issues and topics of the -- of ongoing PDPs, and so therefore, they're drawing from the same pool of volunteers and

competing for the same -- same volunteers that we would otherwise have for some of our other work streams. So this is not just a -- I mean, we're sympathetic to the GAC's challenges here because we share them and we're encountering some of the same limitations.

We are examining some of the ways to streamline the work of this to allow people to come into a PDP, get up to speed as quickly as possible, and become familiar and participate and contribute. And I think, you know, we've talked a little bit about perhaps slowing down the creation of new PDPs until we have, you know -- and understanding what our capacity is for how many PDPs we can actually support at any given time. That's project management 101, and somehow at ICANN we just blow right by that. But additionally, I think, you know, we've talked a couple of times about presentations, webinars, whatever you want to call them, but we found them to be very, very useful in this regard, in taking someone from zero to a basic, workable familiarity with the topic and the workload so that they can contribute in a very short period of time and compressing that learning curve. And we're open to other avenues that we can do that to expand and broaden participation both outside of the GNSO but even within the GNSO to make better use of our existing volunteers.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much, James. And I think we -- you said this before and I think we do believe you that this is also a challenge for you. If this is a challenge for everybody, then the only way to do something about it is to actually prioritize and slow down. And then, of course, as

some people say, well, you can't prevent technical progress from going on. Yes, maybe you can't prevent technical progress from happening, but you can politically decide what the priorities are or economically decide what the priorities are and what maybe can wait, although it's feasible to be done, but it has to wait or it can wait to be done because there's more important things that need to be done first and so on. And so I think -- and we are -- since that session in Helsinki last summer that I was chairing where we had a good discussion on how to reduce workload, also along these lines with one of the most active there was Michael -- Michele Neylon, of course, and we've been trying to work on a document on how to reduce the workload. But the workload was so big that we haven't been able so far to actually finalize that document which is like the chicken and egg problem, of course.

But so yeah, I think we're all aware of the problem. The solution is only very partially there or we are slowly moving in the right direction but probably too slow. So yeah, let's -- let's think about this, and we will keep coming back and torture everybody with the same sermons because it's a torture for us and apparently also for you. So thank you.

JAMES BLADEL: And we are keenly aware that some of the PDPs that we're starting now more recently are multi-year efforts. So that's taking, you know, a lot of resources off the table for an extended period of time, and something that we're mindful of as we -- as we start to look at possible

new issues that could generate -- could ultimately result in additional PDPs.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: I have a few requests for the floor. U.K. and Iran. And then I think it's more or less time for the transition break. Thank you.

UNITED KINGDOM: Okay. Thank you, Chair, and thank you, James, for your comments on that. It's really challenging for everybody in the community. I certainly agree with that.

I think one device that can help us out is forward-looking planning so that all the PDPs, we see what's happening at their various stages and that there's no sort of coincidence of milestones where we have to engage and that the mapping of issues for each PDP is mapped out as -- as -- as effectively as possible so we know what's coming up for the -- down the track as a key element of that PDP where we would again -- it's the kind of thing we talked about before earlier in this session, that there are going to be opportunities where we really need to engage.

And the other point I'll just make, for example, the rights protection mechanisms PDP met here in Copenhagen, the working group, but, you know, I'm completely tied up with GAC work. So the physical face-to-face meetings actually is a challenge when we're fully committed as members of the GAC to the work of the committee here. That's just -- I just point that out as, you know, one -- one problem. Thank you.

JAMES BLADEL: Yes, that's an excellent point. As far as your previous proposal to -- to lay out all of the topics and the timelines so that we can at least -- not commitments but estimates on when certain milestones were occur, a lot of that information, not only is that public available but was just presented to us in our morning sessions where we have updates from the leadership of these PDPs. So we can work with our support staff and our liaison to get that information summarized and presented back for distribution to the GAC.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Iran.

IRAN: Thank you, Thomas. You took the word from my mouth. I think currently there are nine subgroup of the CCWG Work Stream 2. Three of them has almost finished and six of them remains. One of them only has done 10% of the work. If you add the PDP of the GNSO, which I understood, if I'm not mistaken, previously, you have four different tracks. One of them is this new gTLD. So that will be ten.

If you add the IOT, Implementation Oversight Team, you have 11. If you consider to have five days per week, two meetings per year -- a day, 5:00 in the morning, 11, 13:00, then 7:00, then 8:00, human being is human being. I don't think we have such resources. So your work is absolutely right. Prioritize and slow down. Please consider that.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. Thank you very much.

Maybe we get to a point where we can automize government representatives by robots relying on big data and things and then we can all lie around somewhere on a nice beach in Copenhagen in March instead of sitting here. So, yeah, we'll see. Maybe we'll live that day.

So thank you very much. I think this is the end of the session. It was very useful again, even though we do not agree on everything. But I think we understand each other, please, somewhat better, which is already, as always, useful.

Thank you very much, and have a nice --

JAMES BLADEL: Thank you, Thomas. And thank you for having us.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]