LONDON – Domain Name Association (DNA) Presentation to the GAC
Tuesday, June 24, 2014 – 12:00 to 12:30
ICANN – London, England

CHAIR DRYDEN:	Okay. So we have one more item on our agenda for the morning, and that is a briefing from the Domain Name Association on a few topics identified by the GAC.
	So if I can just invite colleagues from the DNA to come and sit at the front, I think that's the easiest thing to do.
	Okay.
	Okay. So let's begin.
	We have had previous briefings from the DNA to inform us about the existence of this new association, and here they are again to present to us on a few topics of relevance to the GAC's discussions this week.
	So who shall I hand over to?
	Okay. So Kurt Pritz to my right will kick things off. Thank you.
KURT PRITZ:	Great. Thank you so much, Heather.
	Hello, everyone. These DNA members are delighted to be here today.

Our purpose is to introduce ourselves as a valuable source of industry information, marketplace information, technical information, to inform your policy discussions.

We think we're valuable in that regard because of our depth of expertise and our diversity. And when I say "diversity," I mean diversity of geography, diversity of business segment and expertise.

And I think that, you know, that diversity will also make the DNA a really valuable and important place for future policy development, such as enhancing protections in domain names, and we intend to pursue that.

Also, reflecting on the discussions we've had in leading up to this presentation, we think that it might be valuable to provide the GAC with a written report sometime after this meeting on the state of the industry. So at the end of our presentation, if you agree with that, let us know, and while we only have a half an hour, we hope there's time for some questions.

So I want to introduce the agenda. So can I have the next slide, please.

Thanks very much. So Adrian Kinderis is the chairman of the Domain Name Association and CEO of ARI registry services. He's going to provide a brief introduction to the Domain Name Association for those of you who aren't fully across it.

And then as Heather mentioned, we worked out this agenda beforehand, and our first topic will be emerging trends in trademark and abuse protections. And for that topic, Jon Nevett of Donuts, co-founder of Donuts, will provide a registry operator perspective, one of the new registry operators. Jeff Eckhaus of Rightside will provide --

EN

what we have here is a registrant protection, so Rightside, as you know, is a registrar and a registry operator, and the registrars have interface with customers, with registrants. And we thought it would be useful for you to know how registrants are dealing with the new trademark protections and the changes in the environment with new gTLDs.

Then Nick wood of Valideus and also a representative of many brands will be presenting a trademark owner perspective on the new protections.

And then lastly, we've been asked to give our perspectives on the IANA oversight transitions, and so Alex Blowers of Nominet will give a ccTLD perspective, and I will give a perspective from the gTLD side.

So that's our agenda.

And, Adrian, if would you take over and give us an introduction to the DNA.

ADRIAN KINDERIS: Absolutely. Thank you, Kurt. I don't anticipate on taking too long to give an introduction to the Domain Name Association.

We have done this a number of times before, but we think we're unique, and I should say first and foremostly, we are outside of ICANN. Our groups -- Am I on the right slide here, Kurt? Can we go back a slide? Sorry. Whoever is controlling the slides.

We are outside the ICANN construct. We are made up of those participating in the value chain within the provisioning and management of domain names.

We are the one tent in town where whether you are a ccTLD or a gTLD, you get to come in under and discuss the issues that affect you.

So we think we're unique in that way. And as Kurt already said, the diversity we have via business models, geography, language, is celebrated and encouraged.

Are we missing a slide? Can I get next slide, please.

Okay. Looks like we're missing one. That's okay. I will just keep making it up as I go along.

Really, we want to take this opportunity today to present to the GAC, to make ourselves an available to the resource to the members here to give you some insights that potentially you wouldn't get within some of the other groups within the ICANN realm. So this is our first foray into doing so and something we would like to make a regular practice.

On to this slide. So really two major themes come up when you talk about the DNA and our role of late, and that is about universal awareness of domain names and the universal acceptance of domain names. And both are challenges that we are continuing to push and see becoming more prevalent in today's environment.

Next slide.

KURT PRITZ: Go back one. There's something in between.

ADRIAN KINDERIS: We're missing slides. Good.

So really, I will -- don't worry about the slides. Listen to my Australian accent and be wowed, as you are with Peter's.

There are three major pillars of the Domain Name Association with the role we perform, one being technical, one being marketing, and one being policy. And really, right now we're trying to find a good balance between how we represent each of those pillars.

We certainly don't want to be seen only as a political organization, but certainly with respect to the IANA transition, we see that that is something that we're very much focused on right now.

Marketing and technical have also stepped up with respect to creating awareness around domain names and their use and utility on the Internet. And so we're pushing hard with the nexus we're at at the moment with the onset of new gTLDs and the potential consumer awareness and confusion that may well come out of that, for the DNA to play a role in promoting domain names and, indeed, the onset of these new alternatives that are out in the market.

And we are not confident that ICANN is playing a strong enough role in this, and so the Domain Name Association is certainly stepping up to ensure that consumers are informed of, as I said, this nexus.

Finally, for a technical perspective, we see our role as not necessarily getting in and rolling our sleeves up to solve technical problems with respect to domain names; that whether that be IDNs working on email or, indeed, the new gTLDs resolving in browsers. We see ourselves more as a curator of all the work that is going on globally. And what we are trying to do -- oh, we have it up; thanks -- is act as a clearinghouse

for information and to create collaboration amongst those that are doing the work.

So I really don't want to get in too much of the way of getting some good information out to you which my colleagues will present now, but hopefully that gives you a good understanding of what the Domain Name Association is, what our role is, and what we're doing moving forward.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you very much for that introduction.

So I think we're moving now into the agenda.

Are you first? Okay. So if you could go ahead, please, and introduce yourself.

JON NEVETT: Sure. Thank you, Heather.

My name is Jon Nevett from Donuts. We are a registry operator that applied for quite a few TLDs in this round.

We wanted to give some statistics on the first page. There are already 320 new TLDs delegated. We're responsible for about half of those at this point. 53 are in sunrise. 31,000 names are in the clearinghouse, which is a bit lower than expected at this point. 65,000 claims notifications have been sent to trademark holders. Nearly 1.3 million domain names registered, and there's some geographical disbursement

there: 22% in the U.S., 17% in Germany, 6% in the U.K. And it's early.
It's early in the process. Many of the highly contested TLDs are not yet
out, not yet delegated, so we should see many more to come.

We were asked to talk about trademark protections for the new TLDs.
On the next slide, this is some alphabet soup but there is the URS, the
UDRP that's been existing, the TMCH, the PDDRP, and the sunrise
process. And in the early days, the URS is operating reliably. That's the
takedown notice and process for cybersquatted domain names. The
results are comparable to the UDRP, even with the higher standard. 85
-- over 85% have been won by the complainant.

The clearinghouse has been functioning reliably. There's been very few
-- relatively few sunrise registrations which we found to be interesting,
and as we predicted.   And then certainly some registrants are
registering names after claims notices are being received, including the
trademark holder themselves. When they register a name, they get
claims notices.

Many -- Next slide, please.

Many registries themselves adopted additional trademark protections.
For example, because we applied for so many TLDs, we have a blocking
system where any trademark holder can buy a block for five years
across all of our TLDs, and that's not only an exact match of their
trademark but it's also, when it contains -- when the trademark is
contained in name. So it could be Verizon, .GURU. Of course all of our
TLDs are Verizon phones, for example.

Other registry operators have adopted similar programs in addition to -- including Rightside, who is speaking later. We got really good feedback from the trademark holders on this blocking process. Over 50% of the world's top brands have purchased our DPML block. Again, it's a five-year process, and there's an override for existing or other trademark holders with the same name. So, for example, united and united or delta and delta.

One point that we wanted to make was that independent protections that are adopted by individual registries aren't necessarily appropriate for all registries. So it might not be a regulatory solution, but we at the DNA have been working on best practices. And we're sharing information and trying to make sure that if something is working for one of us, that we'll share that information and try to have the others adopt similar programs for trademark protection and other purposes.

So with that, I'll move it on to the perspective of a registrar/registrant.

>>   One more slide.

JON NEVETT: We're good. Thanks.

JEFF ECKHAUS: Okay. Thank you, John. So my name is Jeff Eckhaus, and I work for Rightside, and Rightside is the corporation that owns eNom and Name.com, both top ten registrars. And together on our platform, that is 15 million domain names on our platform.

EN

I'm also ex-vice chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group and helped negotiate the 2013 RAA, so I'm very close to many of the topics and issues at hand concerning registrars and registrants, and I'm here today to discuss the impact of the recent trademark and abuse protections on registrants.

As registrars, our channel represents, as you could say, the retail portion of the domain registration experience. We're the ones who touch the customers, who speak to the customers, provide the support to customers. And as a business, we want to provide these registrants with our customers with as seamless an experience as possible.

So it's our goal to provide this in a very straightforward and reliable experience during this process. They come to our Web site with the intention in mind of buying the domain name. And as you can imagine, we would like them to have a good experience, to understand what's going on, understand all the implications. And especially for those that are not familiar with this space, I think for us, we've been involved in ICANN, the domain registration process for so long, but we have to remember there are so many people who are just starting out their business, just starting out a Web site about their lives, their interests, and they really don't understand what all the rules are concerning domain names.

So with that in mind, we try and provide them with a registration path that is stable, frictionless and that will give them all the information they need.

As I said, while this is what we strive for, it is not always the case.

The next slide.

The new requirements in the 2013 RAA include both WHOIS validation and there is verification as well.

So every registrant must periodically verify their WHOIS information. There are certain triggers that bring that about. And they must also validate their address so it's in the proper UPU format. So these are some of the new protections that have been brought on.

There's flexibility to how this is done among registrars. Different registrars have different business models and different touch points, so we have seen a few different methods, but the primary mechanism has been an email from the registrar where the registrar must click a link to validate the WHOIS data.

Unfortunately, what we've seen is that this email that comes through is often ignored by the registrant because, for many, this is not what happened in the past. It's a change to what they're used to. And we're collecting evidence now, and I think as the Registrar Stakeholder Group, I think we'll be sharing that information, but we have seen -- some registrars are seeing up to a 50% drop in domain registrations as their registrants don't click on the validation or verification emails.

And because of this, Web sites are going dark, and it has brought a new type of criminal activity, new type of phishing where people have been sending out email verification stating, oh, you need to verify your domain name, please click on this link, and then that has brought -- it's a new type of phishing scam where it was not sent out by the actual

registrar. It's usual unintended consequences and things we're learning now, and we're collecting a lot of this information.

So as I said, it's too early to recommend any changes, and it's too early to understand the benefits but we are in data collection and analysis mode as registrars, both in seeing the statistics of what happens but also as this is the registrants' perspective, taking all our support tickets, our calls, our emails and collating those. And this is for all the registrars, and we're going to share this across the DNA, all the members, there are many members who are registrars, and share that information so we can get a good understanding of what the impact is to registrants and registrars.

Next slide, please.

Another -- As a part of the new TLD program, the trademark claims process was introduced, and I'd have to say that mechanically, it has worked very well. The interaction between the registrar, the registry, and the trademark clearinghouse has been actually a pretty simple, frictionless process, which is nice.

Unfortunately, due to certain timing, certain registrants must reaffirm registrations. And this has led to, similar to the verification, some confusion. At some points, they didn't do it right away, and then another person came in and bought the domain name. They don't understand the trademark claim, why they need to do this.

Sometimes there are trademarks on generic terms. That's just how it is. So there is a little bit of confusion.

We as registrars can tell you we're trying as hard as possible to explain it to them, but there is some frustration by registrants. And as I said, we're still collecting this data, trying to figure out what the real point of frustration is, what the benefits are, because we believe there are both. And as I said, if possible, we'll share that with the GAC when we have a complete report.

Thank you.

NICK WOOD: Hello, I'm Nick Wood. I'm the managing director of a firm called Valideus. We are working with future contracted parties on 120 or so applications. And we're also a corporate registrar working with brands who want to protect their marks in the domain name system.

If I can have the next slide, please.

Over the years the position of trademark owners towards rights protections within ICANN are very familiar to you. First position that you'll be well aware of is the rights protection measures are inadequate.

Second position, looking broadly across the way this whole sector is changing, is some of these rights protection measures will be valuable, but they're not proven yet.

And recently -- next slide, please -- a third position has evolved. And that's just that a brand registries have begun to go through the process and to sit next to registrars and registry operators and to be a little bit more, if you'd like, entwined into the system that they were before. That greater understanding has led brands to a position where they're

aware of the pressures on different parts of the community from a different perspective. They would like more rights protection measures. Like every other part of the ICANN community, brand owners want more. But, actually, there is a greater understanding.

So where are we now? If I could have the next slide, please.

We're now in a position where trademark owners are looking at their rights protection measures. But the real concern is not about the effectiveness of the rights protection measures at the moment. It's too soon to say. What they're really concerned about is the scale and pace of change. There is enormous disruption that's occurring. So probably what John and Jeff have told you is quite right. But most brand owners are very cautious about backing any rights protection measure over any other rights protection measure, because it's not been happening long enough. As I say on this slide here, this time a year ago there were 22 gTLDs delegated. This week there's some 320, 329 gTLDs delegated.

So this is impactful upon the business of trademark owners.

So, anecdotally, let me give you a bit of background on three particular rights protection mechanisms, which is the TMCH, sunrise, and then the URS.

I went to a couple brand owners and just got some quotes around the corridors here, because, as I said, there's not enough data to look at this certainly yet. The first is that the TMCH is seen as being expensive. It's seen as being complicated, but it's seen as being a good start. And it's seen as having a good team of people working on it. It's a very low number of entries within the clearinghouse. It's just some over 30,000,

if you consider that there are about 15 million trademarks registered globally. So we have to ask questions why that might be.

The IP claims service is definitely seen as being valuable. The sunrise and launch processes is confusion. Could we have more standardization, please? A sunrise before the new gTLDs meant a priority launch period for rights owners. It's begun to mean something which is essentially entwined with the trademark clearinghouse. So brand owners who have gotten used to something developed over a number of years are now beginning to learn something else. Premium names are a problem. Qualified launch programs are a problem. Name collisions are a problem. Because you go to register a name, you're a trademark in the registry and, for some reason, it's not available and you're not sure why. Has it been marked as a premium name? Probably not by a good registry operator, but it could be on a name collision list or it could be reserved for some other purpose.

On the URS -- next slide, please -- the jury is still out. It's certainly something which trademark owners argued for and could prove a very valuable tool.

The clear and convincing standard has been interpreted in the small number of cases so far very, very broadly. So I've got a couple of examples here. Branson.guru, the panelists found there was no evidence of fame. Now, in London Richard Branson thinks he's pretty famous.

BBVA.land. Supposedly, they're providing land services in towns starting with letters starting B, B, V, and A. That doesn't sound like a very convincing business case to me. But it was defended, and it was

denied. Now, it could be because the domain was not pointing to a Web site and there was no use. But mark owners are not fully understanding some of these nuances yet.

Final point I'd like to make is that NAF, who are running -- from the U.S. -- who are running the URS -- they're the biggest panel provider at the moment -- in the early stages have not published very good statistics. They've been really helpful in giving us some numbers. But, certainly, brand owners would like there to be the standardized way of collecting reporting statistics so that we can properly analyze what the success of the URS is and also of the other rights protection measures.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. Just one note. When you refer to things like URS, if you write it out in long form, it helps some of our newer members to follow the discussion. So this refers to Uniform Rapid Suspension, I assume? Okay.

All right. So we're going to move straight into the second topic. And then, perhaps, if we have just a few minutes, we can take a few questions at the very end.

So let's move in to the second part, which is to look at the IANA stewardship issue. And then you have a couple of speakers. Is that right? Please, go ahead.

ALEX BLOWERS:

Thank you, Heather. Alex Blowers from Nominet. I'm going to share with you, first of all, a ccTLD perspective on this issue. First thing is,

having listened to the high-level group discussion yesterday with great interest, it's fair to say that I think most ccTLDs absolutely understand what you might call the geopolitical case for making a change to the IANA arrangements at this time.

What I want to share with you, really, is a consumer or customer perspective on that change.

And I think the first and really important point to make is that the -- at the moment the IANA function works extremely well for all customers, both gTLD customers and ccTLD customers. So, in a sense, where we would start is that's what we want to see continued. We want to see the same levels of service excellence that we've enjoyed hitherto maintained in any future arrangement. And part of that guarantee of the high quality of service has been the contractual arrangement with the NTIA. So, clearly, there's a question of what do we substitute for that is actually business critical for us and for everybody else who is operating in this space.

And I've highlighted here three important things that that backstop of the contract actually provides us with at the moment. And all of those, I think, are important to the -- important features that we need to replicate in any new arrangement.

Next slide, please.

I think it's probably a little bit early to fix on a preferred design for the new arrangement. I'm not sure that the debate has yet reached a point of sufficient maturity certainly for me to know what would be the model solution for a transitioned arrangement. But what I put up on this slide

is some, I think, very important principles which should guide our thinking on this and which I think would be common to all customers, users of the function as it exists today. I don't think anybody will see anything on the slide which is particularly shocking or surprising. Clearly, one of the key questions is what do we do about the last item on this slide around accountability and transparency? One thing I would say is that I think transparency in and of itself is not sufficient to guarantee a continued high-quality of service. So there needs to be more than simply transparency or visibility of what's going on first to actually be comfortable that we will have the right kinds of mechanisms to ensure continued high level of performance.

Next slide, please.

I want to talk now about the particular needs of ccTLDs. And this is where ccTLDs needs, because of their historical relationship with IANA, may differ from those of other customers.   So we think the arrangements must recognize the different status of ccTLDs and their rights along with national governments and of the stakeholders in their respective territories to set their own policies. And that doesn't sound particularly controversial, but there are ways in which the relationship with the IANA and with the IANA function can insert policies by the back door, if you will, which have an effect on the exercise of national sovereignty and individual countries.

There should be no requirement to contract with IANA in our view. Many ccTLDs currently do not have a contract with IANA. Many have a Memorandum of Understanding or some other looser arrangement. And I don't see any reason why this transition should change that

fundamental feature of the system as it exists today. ccNSO should continue to lead on bottom-up policy for all issues related to ccTLDs. That's the mechanism for making policy in relation to the rights of the ccTLD community. And, critically, all other policy matters should be determined at a national level with the local Internet community.

So, in summary, what I'm saying here is that the ccTLDs who have a well-established relationship with IANA and with ICANN which recognizes their national sovereignty should see that maintained in any future arrangement. And that will be an important guarantee for us that this transition does not have unintended consequences which affects us and also affect you as our governments.

Thank you.

KURT PRITZ: Thank you, Alex. The next slide, please.

The gTLD perspective on the IANA transition is remarkably similar. We, too, believe the current system works well. It's free from outside influences. It's purely an administrative function. And the customers of IANA and customers of IANA oversight have been generally pleased. It's important to note that timely implementation of root zone change request is really a stability issue, that TLD operators often upgrade their infrastructure. And the root zone needs to reflect the latest changes so that changes to address new technology or changes in the environment are timely or changes due to change of control are reflected in an up-to-date way in the root zone.

We think that the oversight function currently verifies that IANA has followed its processes. And we think that should continue that. It's essentially an administrative function. And it does not readjudicate the request. Therefore, the root zone function, the management function needs to be really focused on that task and not let -- the oversight function shouldn't let other outside issues, whether they're contractual or some other controversy, affect the root zone management changes.

And we think IANA -- the IANA function has done a very good job of processing changes in a timely way. And we think ICANN is the right home for that. That doesn't mean that this performance should not be periodically reviewed with respect to where the IANA function should be housed. But, as a default, we think ICANN is the right place so long as performance remains at a high level.

Next slide. The final slide for us.

So, with the beginning of this discussion, the community has also raised the issue of accountability and transparency of ICANN as a parallel issue. And we think that's very important for a few reasons. One is that the development of this model should be responsive to IANA's customers. So Alex identified ccTLDs and gTLDs as IANA's customers. And we think that's right. But having arrived at the -- a new and proper oversight model, we want to ensure that that agreed-upon model stays in place, that performance is maintained and that changes aren't made, that there continues to be accountability to IANA's customers. So that's why we think the accountability piece of this transition discussion is very important.

We think, too, that IANA's customers would be an excellent source to start with strawman oversight models. So we would recommend that each of IANA's customers be asked to provide a strawman for community consideration.

We think the development of this process needs to be independent of ICANN and the IANA function. And I think that's been made clear in the public decision across the board.

And, finally, we think that, at the end of the day, the recommendation of IANA's customers, whether they're RIRs or ccTLDs or gTLDs, should not be overridden. So they need to be listened to carefully and not rejected in any way.

So that's all I have. So, Heather, if there's any questions, we'd be happy to take them. And we understand we're the only ones between the GAC and lunch.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Yes. Thank you. You are in that unfortunate situation of being between us and our lunch.

If there are any quick questions that the GAC has, perhaps we can take one or two. Yes, in the back. Yes, please, go ahead.

POLAND: Thank you, Chair. My name is Emil Kedzierski from Poland. This is the first time I had the chance to take the floor. So thank you very much. And thank you for a great presentation.

And I have a question. Because those recommendations for the IANA process were very, very interesting. And is it possible to circulate through GAC -- I don't know -- mailing list or any other form, the recommendations you have towards the IANA transition process to be able to process them, to analyze them, and to give thought about them? Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Poland. So, yes, we do have the slides. They can be circulated. And the DNA is willing to follow up as well if we have questions after this session.

Okay. So we have two more speakers, and then we will break. So Norway and then Russia, please.

NORWAY: Thank you. I would just like to say that we are so happy for this very, very useful presentation for us. Because we get so much data and presentations sent over to us. And this is really compressed information for us about how the system really actually works for the applicants and also for the brand owners and also the cc perspective on the IANA transition. So for us, I think this is extremely useful. So thank you very much.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Norway. Russia.

RUSSIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I had a question. World Intellectual Property Organization, is there any relationship between DNA and WIPO and this -- your practical activities connect somehow to this transition? Thank you.

KURT PRITZ: Thank you for the question. There's no formal relationship between WIPO and the DNA. But, certainly, as we go forward and discuss trademark protections and how they're going to change over time, we all have contacts there and have worked with them and will take their input and give them our advice, too.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. Okay. So I have promises of very short, short questions or comments coming from the United States and the U.K. So I hope you can be brief, please. United States.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you to colleagues for putting up with this last question right before lunch or the last two. I guess U.K. will follow me.

Just a suggestion and you can certainly take this on board and perhaps give us an answer in writing. But I was quite taken with your reference to best practices. And I was curious to know whether any of these best practices might track GAC safeguard advice such as validating and verifying whether any registrant in a regulated or highly-regulated string, whether those credentials might be validated and verified. It

would be useful to know if the DNA was actually embracing this approach. And, if you could also address possibly whether any of your members might be a category 2 string and whether you would voluntarily add the concept of non-discrimination to your registration policy? Thank you.

>>   Thank you, United States. Absolutely. We'll talk about those issues, you know, independently.   We're not in a position to give that kind of commitment for category two. Personally, we don't have any category two ones. And, as far as the highly regulated and regulated ones, we're all entering into agreements now for those TLDs. And, obviously, we'll abide by those agreements. And, to the extent we want to go beyond those agreements like we have in some other cases, we'll be in discussions.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. Okay.

And one last short comment from U.K.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. Thank you, Chair. First of all, thanks for these perspectives from the cc community and the gTLDs community on IANA.

Wonderfully concise, very helpful. Thank you.

Quick question, maybe it's a yes or no answer.   Are you globally representative? Thank you.

KURT PRITZ: The -- the DNA? Yes, thank you, Mark. Oh, yes, we are. So we have --
                         of course, we have members in the United States but several members
                         in Europe, the subcontinent, and the Far East. So we're -- we have --
                         what's great about the DNA is that we're geographically diverse, but we
                         also have as members ccTLDs and gTLDs. And among the gTLDs we
                         have brands. We have some big applicants. We have small applicants.
                         We have back-end providers. And also as members we have gTLD
                         registrars but also ccTLD registrars that aren't ICANN accredited are
                         eligible to join the DNA.

                         So we think that's what makes the DNA an excellent place to have these
                         discussions about trademark protections. Because we can have the
                         brands on one side urging greater protections and registry operators in
                         the same room saying, okay, we can give that and maybe do it in a way
                         that doesn't create costs for our registrants or costs for our businesses.
                         So that's why we think it will be a fertile place to have ongoing
                         discussions. Thanks, Mark.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. And back to Adrian to conclude.

ADRIAN KINDERIS: Yeah. Thanks very much. I just wanted -- we've heard some good
                         feedback on this presentation already. But it would be helpful to us if
                         we could potentially get some formal feedback from the members here
                         as to whether you found this helpful and any another topics in the
                         future you may wish us to cover. We'd also like to ensure that, if you

did indeed find it helpful, that this becomes somewhat of a permanent fixture on your agenda and, hopefully, not always put between you and lunch so, if there are any good conversations we have, might be shortened by your rumbling stomachs.

So thank you very much for the opportunity today, and we look forward to speaking to you again. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you to the DNA. Thank you for everyone that presented. So for the GAC, please be back in the room at 2:00. Have a good lunch but be back at 2:00 as we will be meeting with the Country Code Name Supporting Organization. So let's be prompt. Thank you.

[Lunch break]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]