

Janis:

Traditional joint session and as usual I'll start by giving you some numbers. The first count we're 36 members participating in the meeting, on top of it 2 members participate remotely and 3 observers are following the work of the GAC, namely the League of Arab States for the first time. Organizations are (:33 French).

Apart from that the good news today I received a letter requesting, letter from Afghanistan requesting to join the GAC. So we are fulfilling our quorum requirement because there were initially some questions about that.

So on today's agenda we have 2 questions and maybe one additional. The first one would be a report on the joint working group activities and the second would be on new GTLD's. If time permits we could briefly touch upon ICANN's security and stability and resilience initiative and the DNS SERT initiative to understand the reason and issues around that.

By saying that I'm turning the Mark to you Peter.

Peter:

Thank you Janis and thank you again for arranging this, one of the most important sessions that we have in the Board meetings. Can I ask Board members to put their hands up to identify them, we're scattered around and just in case anybody doesn't know what the Board looks like. It's these ladies and gentlemen with their hands up. Thank you all and congratulations on the progress the GAC is making including the new member application Janis.

The topics you proposed have been agreed and we look forward to moving into it. Thank you.

Janis:

So without further delay I will ask to co-chairs of the working group, Heather and Ray, to give us some information about the progress of work.

Heather:

Thank you and good afternoon everyone. I will begin by giving an overview of what the joint working group discussed on Sunday morning and then I will turn to Ray for any additional comments he may wish to add.

In essence, the joint working group discussed a number of items. First of all, we talked about the role of liaisons within the community. We concluded that there is value in GAC members playing this role and a number of questions to the Board did result from those discussions and so Ray will be I think helping to facilitate responses to those questions.

Things that were discussed, for example, were the difference between a GAC members participating in the Non-Com versus the kind of liaison role on the Board. Then to the supporting organizations and advisory committees. Also the idea that it's not always well understood the nature of the representational role that governments play and how that relates to this liaison function. So we had quite a good discussion and as I say there will be some discussions coming your way in relation to that.

In addition we discussed travel support for developing countries. We believe this is an important part of the work of the joint working group because it is in support of our overall aims which is to increase participation in the GAC and so we hope as part of this work we will be able to recommend an approach for providing travel support on an ongoing or longer term basis.

We also discussed the nature of Secretariat support to the GAC. Malta briefed the joint working group on some efforts made by Malta and the GAC colleagues in order to consider this issue and things that we deemed important in those considerations would be that the Secretariat should be a sustainable model and should assure independence of that Secretariat. And also the importance of continuity in the work of the GAC over long term.

I think GAC consideration of the issue is really in a preliminary stage. So we will be discussing this further, including on Wednesday morning. So that is the Secretariat.

The next item was regarding GAC advice to the Board. We did agree here that it would be helpful if some questions could be drafted regarding things like the nature of GAC advice. In other words, formal versus informal, what constitutes that, the GAC issues, letters, communiqués, principles documents and so on.

Also we thought it would be useful to consider how GAC is received in terms of the process. So what happens to GAC advice once the GAC has generated it? in order to only highlight the interest in this topic, some of the meetings in the community subsequent to the discussions in the joint working group, in particular at efforts related to the delegation and re-delegation and is it retirement working group within the ccNSO, raised in particular the issue of Board recognition of the 2005 GAC principles related to country code top level domains. Again, questions where I think we would need greater clarity in order to facilitate GAC provision of public policy advice to the Board would be things like whether principles are formal or not, and other kinds of documents where the GAC is generating advice.

So I think we will further be refining out questions along these lines. So I will work with Ray to accomplish that and, of course, GAC members and for our part we will need to clarify our own understanding of what constitutes formal advice and what we think is a process that makes sense.

So I will just add by noting that we intended to talk about the policy development process at ICANN and how the GAC can contribute advice in such a manner and early enough that we're really able to strengthen that process. And while we didn't get to discuss it, I would just like to

note that there is a relationship between that aspect of the work and what I've just described in terms of GAC advice to the Board. So we would hope again to draft some questions both for the GAC to consider and the Board that would allow that work to advance.

So Ray is there anything you would like to add?

Ray:

Yes thank you Heather. Let me begin by saying that I feel we had a very fruitful discussion on Sunday morning. I thought we got a lot done. We took the tact of focusing on specific areas so that we could actually make some progress. I'm glad to report that progress really is being made in regards to liaisons. The questions to the Board will actually be worked on first by the Board members of the working group and then we'll figure out the best way of getting that to the Board as appropriate.

The GAC advice to the Board, there are 2 pieces of that. So when someone asks what happens to the advice when it leaves the GAC? One thought is what did the Board do with it but just as important is how did it get to the Board, what happened and so forth. So we're going to investigate exactly what is that process that is in place and how does it really work along the way. Actually we could come back and say whether or not this is adequate.

In addition, the advice given by the GAC into the policy process, as Heather mentioned there was quite a good discussion about getting it into the policy process at a lower time so that it can have a different impact if you will. one of the comments made during the conversation is that the longer you wait in the policy process to make a comment, the more stronger your statement has to be and the more negotiation is involved in that discussion. Whereas, the earlier in the process you are the perspective is really brought forward and appropriate things do happen or are more likely to happen, let's put it that way.

So as Heather mentioned she and I will continue to work together and to move this thing forward. I will say again thank you very much to the GAC members for having us on Sunday, it was a very, very good meeting and so I will turn it back to the Chair.

Janis:

Thank you. Just to illustrate what Ray just said I can inform the Board members that today we had a meeting with the ccNSO. If you recall in Seoul the GAC adopted a draft principle on IDN CCTLD's and we had intercessional work with the ccNSO and today we agreed to rename the document as a GAC Interim Principles on CCTLD's, to send them as a GAC contribution on the working group on IDN PDP and follow up throughout the process to see how these interim principles have been discussed and implemented in the policy. So that is just an example of what happened in this respect during this meeting.

Does anybody want to comment or compliment the report of co-chairs? Sweden, Maria.

Maria:

Thank you so much Heather and Ray for the report and I just want to add one thing. It also talked about what happens if the advice from GAC is actually contradiction to some other advice or group, what happens then? What is the process to handle it?

Janis:

Thank you any other comments from the Board side? Peter.

Peter:

A quick high level comment on some of those points and thank you for the report. I think this working group was set up in response to a recommendation from the President's Strategy Committee in Sydney. So it's excellent to see it underway and coming back with some concrete recommendations.

In relation to the Secretariat, I think it's very important to maintain the independence of the Secretariat but I don't think the GAC should get too hung up on the mechanism by which that independence is maintained. If I can just share anecdotally this was a very similar response that the country code managers had to the idea of ICANN providing them with a Secretariat. Having been effectively at war over issues for a long time there was a lot of mistrust when the ccNSO was formed and the original leaders were very keen to have an independent Secretariat but couldn't get one organized. So ICANN simply started providing Secretariat service.

The result was a huge improvement in the amount of work intercessionally and at the meetings done by the ccNSO. And within a very short time the issue of independence has just disappeared. So I just offer that as an example and while the principle of independence is important actually getting the work done and getting it done efficiently and on time also has to take high priority.

I'm very interested in the developments in relations to advice because there has been a tendency, I think, to confuse everything that emanates from the GAC to the Board as advice. And what we would much prefer is there be much more sophisticated kind of communication between the Board and the GAC so that advice is reserved only for those very final pieces of information which activate the bylaw obligation on the Board to take this seriously and come back in writing. We should have layers of communication between us and so that sounds like a very useful development.

In terms of responding to advice, as I reported at a cocktail party with the GAC last night, it's something that has concerned me and I can confirm the CEO and I have today been discussing the implementing of a new regime for the management of the correspondence between the Board and the GAC so that we are improving the way it is acknowledged, responded and tracked, which is something we've done. But I think probably could do better and Rod is looking into that.

I am a little bit concerned that recently the exercise where in relation to an exercise we were asked where was the notification to the GAC of our intention to do this particular exercise, which is a bylaw requirement. But the current practice has been to rely on the presence of the GAC liaison when all of these decisions are taken. I think that's a better way of doing it. I think if we can have mechanisms like that that work rather than having to send a message to the GAC every time we're about to make a vote that would work particularly well.

And lastly, the idea of liaisons getting involved with the different working groups is fantastic. I totally endorse the comment that Ray makes about trying to shift the inertia of a public policy development process late in the piece. If I could with recording the steps, I can clearly remember the first time in ICANN history that GAC members came out of the GAC room and actually took part in a policy debate at ICANN. I think it was in Rio de Janeiro and since then if I can without risk of embarrassing him, compliment the French delegate who actively participates in these debates and makes a fantastic contribution. And as a result of getting in early gets to grip with these issues and I think that's a model...trying to do it late and as a group is difficult.

So I'm very encouraged by all the developments in the working group and I congratulate them and look forward to the next report.

Janis:

Bruce.

Bruce:

Just want to add slightly to what Peter was saying about the ccNSO because the GNSO has had a similar history as well. It originally had its own budget funded by its members and paid a small amount for a Secretariat. We really didn't have any policy staff behind that.

The real benefit of having a professional Secretariat and someone to write things up is progress between meetings. Before that what tended to happen was everyone in the GNSO is very busy in what I call their day jobs and while they're here in a meeting they may be able to write some stuff but then as soon as they go home they're back to their day jobs and don't do anything until the next meeting comes along 3 months later.

So I think one of the big benefits that you would receive a more stable, permanent Secretariat is that even though the approval process might happen in the 3 month meetings, it's not changing the approval process it is the fact that you can get drafts and work done between the meetings. So when you actually get here you've got a sustaining document to discuss rather than trying to write it on the fly.

Janis:

Thank you Bruce. The first part of your remarks are so familiar.

Heather:

Just a quick response to that and I think absolutely that the most important thing is we are enabled to conduct the work we need to efficiently and so on. It might be worth noting though that from the perspective of GAC members I think we were quite concerned regarding the optics. So when you are external to the organization that arrangements do have that appearance of independence as well. I think that will continue to be a factor in our discussions.

Janis:

Thank you. Alice from Kenya.

Alice:

We would like to thank the ICANN Board and community, especially for resolving to get on with the meeting in Kenya despite the challenges and note that the geographic rotation of meeting locations is an important feature, which is very unique to and special to ICANN.

However, we feel we need to really ask ourselves what do these ICANN meetings leave behind in various regions and all countries? Kenya, for example, had ideas regarding the possible domino effect and impact that this meeting would have had in the East African region, especially in times of understanding ICANN in terms of increasing participation and outreach, assisting with outreach efforts for various stakeholders. And specifically understanding internet policy and governance generally.

I mean as you probably all know, Kenya has offered to host the 2011 IGF but unfortunately we spend most of the month leading up to this meeting occupied and dealing with issues of security and we feel it's due to badly handled communication around it. This is not to deny at all that there were credible fears around the meeting security, particularly when it touches on terrorism incidents. But we feel communicating these fears and efforts being made to ensure everyone's safety could have been handled more diplomatically and respectfully for Kenya as a host, as well as recognition for all the hard work that went into organizing this, the local organizing committee as well as ICANN's staff.

We also note that nearly all of the contracted parties, Registries and Registrars are missing physically. While that says quite a lot in terms of having really developed a remote participation, the meetings being held in New York parallel we then question what does this mean for ICANN processes? Has ICANN's foundation commitment to introduction of competition and diversity in the DNS on the decline? Should we be introducing a competition framework, a global one? Is it time to explore the possibilities of that perhaps? Then what is going to happen to the process of new GTLD's with registration of GTLD's that are extremely prohibitive, especially for developing countries. We've talked about that for a quite a while but haven't seen that reflected concretely.

Finally, we would like to congratulate ICANN's commitment to the principles of transparency, especially the very active use of social networking tools, like Twitter, in terms of informing the community. Again, we emphasize that some of the issues that affect a country's process should be handled more respectfully and sensitively. They do tend to impact on not only the general effectiveness and efficiencies of organizing ICANN meetings but also issues that go beyond just the internet, broader issues to do with investment and tourism.

So again we welcome you all again to Kenya and we look forward to a very productive meeting. And hope with the intention of the AOC, for example, which are aimed toward internationalizing ICANN, then that ICANN begins to really take other principles of diversity and work towards understanding other perspectives and interests. Thank you.

Janis:

Thank you Alice. Thomas, please.

Thomas:

Just to add up to experience which Bruce and Peter talked about, the Secretariat support, I think we already have the support and I think Janis can speak to this. Tomorrow when we have a very crucial day I think, we have to decide for a direction in which we can have a sustainable and independent Secretariat.

I think in all ways we go further. I think we will continue and reinforce the support we can use from ICANN in this. Thank you.

Janis:

Thank you Thomas. Rod would you like to say something?

Rod:

Yes I would. I would like to thank Alice very much for her comments and note that the staff was, first off the staff worked extremely hard to make sure this event stayed in Nairobi and it was not easy given much feedback in some of the communities sharing concerns. But it was due to our commitment as well to one world, one internet; everyone connected and also would note that when we signed the Affirmation of Commitment and made a commitment to the world for transparency and accountability it actually places us in a difficult situation in many moments because at times transparency doesn't correspond to diplomacy. Certainly that was the case even in the ICM case where a decision was rendered and we published it.

And yet we made that commitment and so we appreciate the feedback. We tried to be very sensitive to the situation in Kenya. At the same time, we had the community members demanding of us full disclosure of any information that we might have. So we sought to strive for a balance to support the program in Kenya, which we very much believed in and wanted to

see and we're thrilled we're here and we're extremely appreciative of the terrific efforts by you and the Kenyan government and Kenic and the private sector here to support this very important event.

At the same time, we felt it was our responsibility to disclose any relevant information that we might have. So we very much appreciate your comments on diplomacy and seek to always learn more and at the same time we'll admit we find it difficult at times to find the balance and perhaps we didn't find the right balance. So we appreciate the feedback and we will continue to strive to do our best and we're thrilled to be here. Thank you.

Janis:

Thank you Rod. May I suggest we move on to the next agenda item related to new GTLD's? We as we promised in Seoul we're working on the comments on the draft applicant guidebook version 3. We are expecting to conclude our discussions tomorrow and present these comments subsequently informal for communication to the Board.

Now I would like to invite Mark who is holding this exercise to walk us through the main points.

Mike:

Thank you Janis and good afternoon to everybody. As Janis has recounted we undertook in Seoul to review the state of play with new GTLD's initiative and we've been working hard intercessionally and consulting and discussing in teleconferences and so on. We are in the process of drafting a letter for your Chair to send to the Chair of the Board which will include advice to the Board on this key area of activity for ICANN. We intend this letter to be attached to our communiqué at the end of our meeting this week.

We are in the process of drafting but we thought it would be useful for the Board to provide a head's up on the key issues we're going to cover in the letter at this meeting. First of all, we will restate our acknowledgment of the potential benefits of an expansion of the GTLD space in terms of stimulating innovation, promoting competition and new opportunities for businesses and communities and indeed for users.

This is a well established consensus. There isn't any administration in the GAC which is opposed to the GTLD initiative on principle. There is this consensus of support on the principle of this important development of the GTLD space which ICANN is undertaking. The letter will go on to consider where we expect to see further work to be undertaken before the launch of the GTLD program can be made, work that the GAC believes has to be done before that point of launch can be reached.

We cover 4 overarching areas where work has to be undertaken in our view. Firstly, a community consensus needs to be reached that there will be no negative impact on the resilience,

security and stability of the DNS arising from the expansion of the GTLD space. So that is the root scaling issue.

Secondly, action to be undertaken to ensure that the expansion of the number of new GTLD's doesn't lead to an incumbent increase in malicious conduct and abuse of the DNS. Thirdly, we indicate broad support for the STI proposals specifically for the trademark clearing house and the URS but we will argue that further work needs to be done to refine those proposals with the aim of maximizing the protection of the interests of trademark owners.

Fourthly, we will continue to press for the early conclusion of the economic studies we've long pressed for. Studies that will enable us to consider the relative benefits, costs, the potential for the exercise of Market power, the potential burden of defensive registrations for brand holders and other related economic and financial interest issues. We've long called for those economic studies and we need that analysis to be completed.

We recognize there is ongoing work in all those 4 crucial areas and we are anxious to see the results of that work and to be able to review the relevant documents when they are issued. So we will continue to regard this as a priority area for the GAC and we will work throughout this year to engage and to react and comment and to add to the comments that we're making this week and in anticipation of version 4 of the draft applicant guidebook.

The letter will go on to cover some points of detail. I won't go into all of them now, particularly as we haven't finalized our discussions of these at this meeting. We have another session tomorrow. But I think it is useful if I indicate 2 points that we will restate. The first one is that we restate the GAC position on not allowing country or territory names in the GTLD space. The letter will also argue for the need to improve objection mechanisms and mechanisms for post delegation deviation from the conditions for approval or non-objection to the use of geographical names. These are key issues that we've discussed quite a lot during the course of our meeting and previously in our conference calls.

We I think just to round off there is one crucial area that we want to comment on and that is the communication strategies for the GTLD program with particular regard to the stakeholder interests in developing countries.

I hope those points I've summarized have been helpful and as I say kind of a head's up for you before we actually finalize our position in the communiqué and the letter of the Chair to the Board that will be attached to the communiqué. Thank you.

Janis:

Thank you.

Peter:

Mike I very much look forward to receiving that. Can I just pick up on 2 points you raised. Certainly there is complete agreement by the Board on the first one that we don't do anything without making sure the security and stability and resilience of the system is safe.

You say about the more action is needed to ensure that the new GTLD program won't result in an increase of malicious abuse. I hope when you do send us that letter you include the basis for the claim to start with. What is the basis for wondering whether this might happen? Before we start developing a program to prevent it we would like some indications as to what the basis for the supposition is. What fact based studies have you done or what information are you privy to? I know you've been consulting with the FBI and other agencies, what is the basis for the suggestion that this might happen? Knowing where it comes from would be very helpful.

The third point and I appreciate the support for the trademark protection mechanisms you have indicated, and you said work is going to be required, again detail what further work, what areas remain unprotected in relation to those 2 particular mechanisms? I commented in the public forum peace has almost broken out between the warring parties and I took a great deal of comfort from the fact that they are happy. So if the GAC wants to go further than the compromise the parties themselves have reached it would be very helpful to know where and why. So if that could be included in the letter that would be very helpful. Thank you.

Janis:

Jean Jacque.

Jean Jacque:

Thank you and I found that brief expose extremely interesting and instructive and, of course, through our Chairman we're looking forward to seeing more of it in detail. I have 2 questions or remarks; one is about the diversity of applicants. I don't know if that's a word you prefer to categorize. What I'm aiming at is there is a natural drive for business led requests for names, for strings, but I wanted to know if you had omitted mentioning this aspect or if it will be included in your letter? Ensuring the diversity of needs are met, for instance, ensuring NGO's, of cultural entities, etc.

My second point is about your mention of economic studies and I noted with care that you said the completion or completed economic studies. I beg to differ on this because I have seen...so the economic study as you know has been used sometimes by certain quarters including people operating large business enterprises in countries of the OECD let's say as perhaps a pretext to delay somewhat the introduction of new GTLD's. And however legitimate the business interests may be I for one consider that this is not a make it or break it consideration for ICANN.

I think that the inclusion of economic data, the findings of top economists is of importance of interest but it should not be a blockage to the implementation and at least to the finalization of the guidebook. Thank you.

Janis:

Thank you Jean Jacque. I'll take Rod and then Bruce.

Rod:

Mark I thought I would respond to a couple of the points you raised in your remarks. The first was the comment on the communications strategy and issues for new GTLD's and how important that is and particularly to make sure that's global and really engages in developing countries as well as the more developed countries, which are more likely to have a lot more data on the program because of the rich community involvement in the ICANN processes and familiarity with the domain name system.

We actually would very much appreciate the GAC's formal advice as well as your assistance. You know your countries around the world, you represent over 90 countries and you understand them well. You know the wiring of your industry and you would have excellent ideas on how we can successful build a program to deliver the messages to the key audiences in your countries efficiently given that most of this needs to happen not on a paid for basis but on a relationship basis or informative basis. And you're in the best position to be the experts on that.

So we would very much like that assistance and advice from the GAC and I'll speak with Peter later to see if we can maybe issues a letter or something formally requesting that assistance. We also recognize there is definitely that difference between developed countries and developing and maybe in the responses you can suggest if you think that is a separation appropriate with different suggestions for each category. So we would very much appreciate your help and advice on that and take that charge and responsibility seriously.

Secondly, you asked a good question about economic studies and where things stood on that. Janis, Mr. Chairman, if possible I would like to have Kurt Pritz our expert on that topic provide the GAC with a quick update.

Kurt:

Thank you Rod and I'm not sure as I qualify as an expert in any regard. Understanding and agreeing with Jean Jacque's comment that an economic study shouldn't retard progress or progressing the guidebook version 4 so we continue to work on that. ICANN is engaged with 2 economists to undertake additional study to build on what has been done in the past. Specifically they've been in a potential 3 phase study and they've been tasked with 3 deliverables. One is developing a metric or model for determining the costs of defensive registrations, two is developing another model for assessing benefits versus costs for the GTLD program overall cost

to users and registrants, and third trying to make that determination or model on an individual basis, so could individual GTLD applications be assessed to determine if the potential detriment outweighs the benefit. And perhaps using that model on a case by case basis for assessing new GTLD applications after the launch.

Right now those economists are in phase 1 where they're doing a survey and assessment. They've requests and received significant data from ICANN and asked very pertinent questions already in understanding the difficulty with trying to assess what is essentially unknown, the degree of innovation we're going to see going forward and the like.

So the first deliverable, the survey, is due in March, the middle of March. The second deliverable is timed so we can discuss some of that in the Brussels meeting in June. I hope that is what you were looking for Rod.

Rod:

Thank you Kurt. I would take questions if there are any?

Janis:

Thank you Rod and Kurt for clarification. Bruce.

Bruce:

I just had a question regarding the comment about the country and territory names and the G space versus the C space. I want to be clear I understand where the GAC is recommending. Just so I understand the hierarchy, you could probably start the hierarchy at the level of the planet, so we can have .earth and then we have regions and oceans, so we have the Pacific Ocean and the Indian Ocean and I haven't really heard any comments about it at that level.

The next level you get down to regions and so we have Africa, South America, is it correct that the region is not considered part of the CC space? In other words, Africa would be considered a G? Then you get down to a country level, so I think that from what I'm hearing is pretty clear. You're saying if you want .Australia, .Australia should be treated as a CCTLD. Then you have a capital like Cambra of Australia and I gather that's fairly, I'm not sure whether that's going to be treated as a CCTLD or not, perhaps you can clarify. Then you have cities like Sydney. Sydney is a big city in Australia but I've been to 2 other Sydney's in the world and there could be more, so that's not something that immediately falls under any one country.

But just clear on which part of that hierarchy does form in what you call the C space? Also what benefit do you see in the C space versus the G space? I think from my perspective or my benefit on the G space is you have a contract and it's got standards to protect things like trademarks, which you don't have in CCTLD because they can vary dramatically. And maybe what you can consider is trying to get a nexus between the country law and the ICANN contracts. You have a

minimum standard in the ICANN contract but then you have country laws taking precedence over anything that is in that contract.

So you try and get the best of both worlds because I think we've been stuck on this with the IDN and CCTLD's where the Board has a lot of concern is we're moving from a model where we had standard contracts and clear technical requirements to a model where we didn't have that. Then we had all sorts of assurances that would be dealt with at the country level.

I'm wondering if you can merge the two and say for a geographic region it has a contract with ICANN like for the country that is responsible for that region, say a country name like .Australia that any laws Australia passes would take precedence over anything that is in that contract. It's just an idea but I want to be clear, what part of the hierarchy do you think is in the C space that I described? And what benefit do you see of the C space over the G space?

Janis:

Thank you Bruce. I think in ICANN's history we've have witnessed a number of collisions in contractual requirements and national laws. So it is nothing new, it's always difficult and I agree that we should try to strive for getting best out of both but sometimes it's very hard.

I will turn now to Hubert and I believe he will be talking about the differences and we will be answering your questions. After that I have Bertrand and then we'll see Mark or somebody else.

Hubert:

Thank you and first of all I would like to thank Rod for his comment on communication because I think that it is really very important issue. And my country we made this conference in December together with our business associations, organized from our ministry and other associations. We had quite a good participation and I think quite interesting discussions. It was very informative for us and also for the community. I got very positive response to this and I think this is the kind of interaction we should use in the future.

My remark would also be if there is a need, for example, what it was for seen on the EOI there was also planned some kind of communication phase. I don't know whether there will be a decision on EOI that has to be discussed separately. But if I would recommend that we, I at least would be prepared to organize or help organize at least finding the addresses of the companies we could invite and I think that would be the most important issue and therefore I really would appreciate if we could develop this kind of discussion within our community. I do not do it for me and ICAN doesn't do it for ICANN purposes, it is for our community in this context for our businesses that they are aware of what's happening in the GTLD process and they participate in this discussion. I think that is very important.

Concerning a more general remarks regarding geographical names because we in our country have several communities that are going to apply for geographical strings. We as the government

supports this issue in general as far as a local community, also support or at least none object to this initiative Nevertheless, we see some questions we should discuss and develop further.

One question is and for me it's also almost some (46:31 – inaudible) what I mentioned in this group very often, it's a definition of geographic names. I think it is not covering the needs we need. Just a couple of examples, NYC is an abbreviation and not a geographic name according to the applicant guidebook because only the full name New York would be the city name. We have Barcelona, BCN, it is not a geographic name, in Germany we have one of our states that is very difficult to pronounce and nobody would use it, everybody would use NRW and the .NRW wouldn't be a geographic name.

Therefore, I think we need more advance in this question of definition. I hope and the interesting thing also our industry supports these issues. It's not the governments want to intervene in some business cases, no our industries also support this point of view and therefore I really would ask ICANN or ICANN staff to introduce some kind of mechanism that helps to overcome this.

And maybe I can come to a further question concerning our geographical name discussion. I think URI is one issue we are discussing but we see it a bit difficult because I see it as a platform a geographical name would be a bit different because in the traditional system the string or the applicant would have come to our ministry or government or to the local community and ask for a non objection letter. Afterwards he could apply.

Now we have this process in advance and I as a government cannot give this okay before I know what is needed to complete a regulation and therefore I think it's a bit difficult, especially for the geographic names. Thank you.

Janis:

Thank you Hubert. Bertrand you're next.

Bertrand:

First of all, I think the discussion we just had about geographic names shows that as was mentioned in the panel yesterday there is one group of strings that are generic strings but the others are not. The brand GLTD's are not generic, the geographic names are not generic, the community ones are not so much generic. So what we're witnessing is the interest in the different types of constraints that are applicable or not. As a matter of fact, we can begin to consider the CCTLD's were actually the first in the more general category of geographic names.

The second point is related to a very concrete question. If a city, for instance, makes a choice of applying directly for the management of the string what is the type of contract that will be made between the city itself as the manager and registry and ICANN? Is it a different public contract than the general type of contract?

The third comment is this is going directly to the question of the economic studies. One element that is very important is a better understanding of the structure of what I don't want to call the Market but the domain space. One element in the space is to remember that under the term "competition" we're addressing very different things.

One thing that is clear is traditional competition between back end registry service providers. Another layer is completely different is competition between TLD's themselves and here it seems clear and it would be great if some of the studies were exploring that a bit more that .IBM is not a TLD that competes with .Sports. That .London is not actually competing with .Gal and even within generic TLD's .music is not directly competing with .Echo.

On the other hand, you can consider that .music might be competing with a potential .jazz or .hiphop or that sort of thing like clusters. This sort of understanding of the Market structure going a little bit beyond saying this is one Market with one rule would be very beneficial.

And finally 2 quick points, not enough attention at the moment, it's not in our comments but something I wanted to raise, has been paid to single registrant TLD's and the regime that is applicable to them. What are your thoughts about this, particularly for brands? And the final point is when you look at the generic terms; of course, we have the potential to go to 63 characters in Latin alphabet. However, it is clear that in this range of potential letter combinations the short strings that also correspond to dictionary keywords are clearly of particular value.

And not only are they of particular value because they're short but they also have a meaning which is a common word and the term "common word" means it belongs to the community that uses language. Therefore, wouldn't it be interesting to explore whether special attention shouldn't be paid to who applies for the delegation or how the delegation of strings that are less "x" characters and are dictionary keywords would be made. Because these are more a common property and more public interest dimension. It is just a suggestion. Thank you.

Janis:

Thank you Bertrand. I think Peter wants to ask a question to Mark and then Rod you wanted to say something.

Peter:

Mark I can see you're collecting notes and we're going to come back to you and get some...I just wanted to put one in there that I forgot to mention earlier. You mentioned GO names to start with and then you moved on from that to talk about the post delegation dispute process. I want to tease that out a little bit.

First of all, it's important to recognize that the issue of geographic names is the first time we may run into a conflict between the Board and the GAC on advice. We wrote after the Mexico

meeting actually formally alerting the GAC that we may be about to not follow GAC advice in relation to geographic names. And we've had a letter back from the GAC basically reasserting the GAC advice and saying here is what we want. And that's where that matter currently stands as we've gone onto other issues.

But our position hasn't changed either, so we stand in this position of we may well be about to formally disagree with GAC advice in relation to particular geographic names.

But to move on from that to the question of the post dispute delegation process, yes there is now for the first time in the system some post delegation dispute processes. One of them relates, in particular, to communities and it was my understanding that that would be the place where geographic TLD's that were, that we had got to agreement on if, for example, there was a contract in relation to a city name or regional name and governments had given approval to a Registry operator to run that and the Registry operator then reneged on that agreement, it would seem to me that the current post delegation process is available because it's a community.

But if you don't think that's appropriate I think we could have some careful attention paid to the particular one of geographic name communities in a post delegation process. So I guess what I'm asking is let us know if the current post delegation processes are not going to be satisfactory in relation to those contracts to which government approval has been a key term and it may be different set of processes may well be required there. Thank you.

Janis:

Thank you Peter. There are a lot of complexities in this issue and a lot of options. We have been through all of them and the key element here is that the government should be involved and government should have a certain precedence in decision on redelegation when it comes to city names or things which are of particular interest to government. But I believe GAC members will go maybe more in detail.

Rod you were asking for the floor.

Rod:

Yes briefly, Hubert I want to thank you very much for that outstanding event that you and the German government organized (56:03 German word) Internet in Berlin. That was a great surprise to me at the rich group you brought together. There were several hundred private sector leaders from legal area companies that were interested, Registry service providers; it was an amazing cross section of industries. And we were very honored to be there. You had a well structured program where I know ICANN gave 3 different topical presentations. But that is a showcase example of what would be helpful for us with other governments around the world. If you have an interest to bring your community together specifically to discuss new GTLD's we

will do our utmost to deliver staff and resources to you to speak at that event or provide materials.

But I think that was a terrific model and I just want to thank you very much for all the effort you put into that.

Janis:

Thank you Rod. Norway.

Ernest:

Yeah a quick response to that and we feel those post delegation procedures are not currently comprehensive enough to cover our concerns. So that is something that should be looked at in more detail.

Also a quick comment on the geographic names also related to the question from Bruce, is the country and territory names reading interpret the existing (57:44 – inaudible) codes CCTLD's that we feel that the exercising of the national adherence to national legislation is best served within the national jurisdiction currently the system with the existing CCTLD's. That is our opinion. Thanks.

Janis:

Thank you, Mark from United Kingdom.

Mike:

Thanks very much. I think the nature of this discussion shows how some of these areas are indeed very complex and how diligently we on our side are trying to find a way forward. We do seem to have reached a bit of an impasse and have to think how we move on from that impasse with regard to country and territory names. The other post delegation stuff I think we've covered with a couple of the other responses but it's ongoing work that we all should work effectively together to try and find those solutions.

Going back to your earlier question about malicious conduct, we and other GAC delegates are working very closely with the law enforcement agencies. We're getting a lot of valuable contributions from them as I'm sure is the case on your side. There are 2 colleagues of mine from Serious Organized Crime Agency and I think they would back me up on this expectation that if nothing is done the increase in malicious conduct will be significant if there is a significant number of GTLD's. But I'll have to consult with my SOCA colleagues on the data to back that expectation up if you like.

On STI we in the UK and Europe have a major problem with this. If the clearing house will only admit trademarks which have been backed up by substantial review that knocks out all European

trademarks because the Office of Harmonization of the internal Market doesn't require substantive views to be undertaken for trademarks.

In the UK the Intellectual Property Office has abandoned that back in 2007. So what is going to happen to all those trademarks? That is one issue. The other issue is trademark owners are complaining to me in the UK, I haven't fully bottomed this out with GAC colleagues, that the requirement that they pay is deemed as totally unfair. They pay to register their trademarks, why should they pay for the clearing house when the clearing house is designed to address a problem that the trademark owners themselves have not created. There is a lack of logic there regarding payment of fees.

Okay you may come back on that but that's certainly an issue that has been raised with me in the UK.

On communication strategies I think a number of the GAC delegates can help on this. An immediate thought that comes to mind is a number of us are involved in national and regional internet governance forums, IGF's and for ICANN to engage with these national and regions IGF's on this issue to promote awareness of the opportunity I think there is a readymade vehicle there and we can work with ICANN to inform you of those IGF's.

In the UK I'm working with the UK IGF, the European IGF, and also the Commonwealth. That's 50 plus countries and so we have a platform that we can help out on in terms of enhancing and complimenting your communication strategies. So that's an immediate thought. I hope that's helpful. Thanks.

Peter:

Can I just come back on the clearing house and let's be very clear the clearing house is not a right to protection mechanism. And it's a service to help brand owners. One of the features of owning a brand is you have to defend it, it's a piece of your property and so owners get used to the costs of defending it. In a largely untested allegation, brand owners came forward and said if there are a large number of Registries we will have to go and protect our brand in each of those Registries. And the clearing house is an attempt to provide a simpler and cheaper system for brand owners to do, what in my view is entirely their own responsibility which is to protect their own brands.

ICANN certainly doesn't have any responsibility to help brand owners protect their brands. That's a private property right of theirs. The clearing house is a mechanism instead of having to check 50 or 300 Registries it means they can go and do it once. Now if brand owners don't want that service they don't have to pay for it. The suggestion that they have some right to be in there and someone else should pay for the cost of putting a database together to protect private property rights I think needs very careful attention.

This is a service provided on the basis that they then don't have to go and find on an individual basis Registry by Registry. As I say, it's an untested ascertain and the data we've seen suggest brand owners currently don't go and register at every Registry to protect brands nor are they infringed on every Registry. So this is a very conservative approach to provide an assisted protection mechanism for a threat that hasn't actually been proven.

I think there is a lot more thinking to do from some of the brand owners if they're starting to think this is some right they have. It's an assistance mechanism to keep their costs down.

Janis:

Thank you Peter for that explanation. Mark.

Mike:

Thanks and if I can pick up further from Peter's very useful comments, it is something that was raised with me and again I think there is some misunderstandings around the role in particular of the clearing house. But more importantly I think there was some misunderstandings around the question of substantial review. And having relooked at the paper I can understand that now that misunderstanding because the language is not clear enough.

As I can see it and a position I would accept having come from a country where we created 2nd and 3rd class citizens, I would hate to now start telling people from different countries that their trademarks are 2nd or 3rd class trademarks and they don't fit the role of a 1st class trademark.

The idea as far as I can understand it is that any trademark holders are entitled to put any Mark into the clearing house database. The key issue is what the Registry then does with the clearing house. The first option I have is to offer some sort of sunrise process. The sunrise process means anyone who is in the clearing house has the ability to pre-register which is why I would object to anybody renaming the EOI as a pre-registration. So you simply note your interest and on registration you are immediately entered into the Registry database as the holder of a domain for a particular name because your trademark rights are noted in the database.

It doesn't deal with the fact that people may have concurrent trademarks in multiple jurisdictions or in different classes. So that is the sunrise option and with the sunrise you would want it to be absolutely identical.

The other option that is used is an IP rights protection, which means when you're in the database as soon as a string is entered as a registration under a new GTLD, a notice will go to the potential registrant to say this name is registered in our clearing house. Somebody has a trademark. We haven't tested the veracity of the trademark, we haven't tested the trademark to assess whether it comes from a substantial review jurisdiction or not. But there is a trademark in the clearing house database which matches the name you are looking for. Do you want to continue bearing in mind you may then be challenged?

Now that would take up the typical defense which is raised in the vast majority of EDRP cases, which is I didn't know. They are a small entity in the UK, I don't live in the UK, I don't do business in the UK and I have no idea of their trademark. My name was generated through my independent thought and my own innovation in my own country. I wasn't aware and I had no intent to infringe a trademark. I simply wanted to do business on my own.

That defense is taken up with the IP claims and the person knows they potentially are infringing and that they may get a complaint or some sort of dispute process launched against them. At the same time the IP Claim will notify the trademark holder whose name is in the clearing house that somebody is registering a name which matches the string loaded into the clearing house. Then the 2 parties can make their choice.

Now if you have a trademark in the name Widget with no interest in protecting your trademark in music or blog or any number of other new GTLD's, you may let the majority of registrations go because you don't really want it enforced. But when it comes to your industry, food for example or engineering, then you would pursue aggressively if you haven't registered yourself yet, you would pursue that potential infringement aggressively.

My personal view is that perhaps an IP Claims process is the better way to go. And maybe the next version of the DAG will push in that direction. The other thing is Registries are entitled when dealing with entries in the clearing house to then decide what to do with them. So we've seen different rules. For example, in the last round of new GTLD's we a requirement to, one of the clearing houses that you have to have had a trademark for 5 years to avoid some of the circumstances we had in the .eu situation around trademarks prior to the domain registration period.

So you could put as a Registry and we're not going to impose and in my view we shouldn't impose honoring that obligation. We could suggest to them that you may want to have a minimum 1 year waiting period; you may want to consider substantial review versus non-substantial review. But once the name is in there the Registry then has a choice of what to do with it and how to deal with it. And the responsibility to do that appropriately, fairly, ethically and inform everybody of the mechanisms that they're going to use.

What I think would be the most useful thing to come from the GAC is if you had some particular thoughts as to what the most appropriate mechanisms are and you wanted to give us advice as to what you felt was the most appropriate from the relatively detailed exposition I've given I think that will be incredibly useful because it points us in a direction rather than saying there is a problem, do something about it.

Janis:

Thank you Mark. I have Hubert in line and then the European Commission and then depending on time we're getting close to the end of the session. Hubert please.

Hubert:

Thank you for the interpretation and discussion on trademark because it's really important for us. I also welcome the discussion we had during the last 1 to 1 ½ years because I think there is a very positive development and I think nobody would contradict this.

I also want to remark that what the regime we're developing is not only for the trademark holders. I see it also as regime that mitigates problems we may face concerning legal conflict. And we are developing a regime that is avoiding legal conflict. I would like to point out that the involvement of private buddies we are discussing and developing now. They do not include in any case decisions by the appropriate class.

In many cases applications may provide good indications, they may if both parties agree upon it deliver quick and less costly decisions that we also appreciate very much. But nobody is obliged to use this application and therefore it cannot be excluded that 3rd parties appeal to the public courts that are not bound the decision and the regime of this private arbitration. That is from my point of view that IP tracking mechanisms meet the requirement of the national and international trademark laws and regulations. Thank you.

Janis:

Thank you Hubert. I would like to indicate with Peter we were suggesting we go about 15 minutes over our time. We have at least one important issue to cover, which hasn't been touched yet and that's EOI. We have an extensive discussion about that. But since there is about 20 minutes to go I would like to encourage those who speak be relatively brief.

The European Commission and then France and then Dennis Jennings.

European Commission:

Mark thank you for this explanation. I want to take home 2 points and make 1 point. I appreciate you said that you don't want a 2 class system. And having been involved in the first one in the C Space dealing with 27 different regimes that is something we had to avoid as well. That is a result we really have to avoid because otherwise we go regime picking and it's going to be very problematic, number one.

The second thing I would be reluctant to follow your invitation. We have discussed it to propose something that's really your job to propose a mechanism because that is your field. So I would there be rather reluctant. But I take home we don't want a discrimination, we don't want a 2 class system in trademark holding, we want an open indiscriminate access to the system. Thanks.

Janis:

Thank you. In the reverse order Dennis Jennings will be speaking about economic studies and then we will go to EOI.

Dennis:

I would like to make a small comment about the economic studies. I'm not economist but much of the work I've seen is describing an economy I don't recognize. It seems to be based on classical views of consumer goods and doesn't seem to take into account any of the particularities and straight behaviors that occur in the domain name space and the nature of the domain name industry, the nature of the domain name conflict with trademark rights and so on.

I've seen some recent work which is much better but my point is I'm a little surprised about the passivity of the request for more economic studies. Most nations, even Ireland with the Economic and Social Research Institute have very powerful economic study mechanisms available to the administrations, much more powerful with much more money spent than ICANN could possibly spend in this area.

So it would be very useful input and advice from the GAC if you were to go to your Economic and Social Research Institutes and ask them to do a modern study of the economics of the internet, economic and social study of the internet and its impact and feed that to us rather than passively ask us to do more and more studies in a situation where we're extremely budget limited. Thank you.

Janis:

Thank you Dennis. France, Bertrand, EOI

Bertrand:

Yeah I still would like to maybe get an answer later on; on the question of if a public entity applies for a TLD what is the regime that will be...

Peter:

The answer is it's a GTLD contract.

Bertrand:

Okay. So on the EOI; first of all, I think the GAC is expressing gratitude to the Board for following the advice of waiting until Nairobi to allow community interaction.

There has been a tremendous amount of work done by the staff to summarize the comments that have been put online and also to try to improve the formula that was made. However, from the last 3 days and from the various comments before, it is clear that today there is no consensus in the community on either a yes or no regarding the current proposed EOI.

And unless I'm mistaken our understanding is it might be the case within the Board itself that it is very difficult at this stage to decide fully yes or fully no because the discussion on the EOI has

raised very interesting elements, it has actually nurtured the debate, however, the current mechanism still raises several difficulties that I would like to highlight.

The interesting thing about the face to face possibilities and the fact that we're present here is a few points have emerged, they're not consensual but it seems like a trend. The first thing is a certain number of actors who were initially supportive of the EOI have actually changed their minds and have had second thoughts, including the most anxious public applicants who are now considering that it may mostly add further delays.

The second point is that as we were seeing and as Hubert has mentioned the EOI in this current form is creating a differential treatment from the treatment that certain types of applicants might have in the current DAG. So therefore, it is not just an introductory mechanism, it is changing the balance favoring some actors and disfavoring others. So the balance in this respect has to be taken into account.

The third element is as we said yesterday in the panel, the discussion on the EOI has somewhat exacerbated or in any case highlighted some of the problems that we may not have seen clearly in the current DAG regarding fairness of treatment among the different types of applicants or the different types of strengths.

Finally and probably most importantly the more it goes the more it seems to be recognized in the community that this is, of course, not a mere data gathering exercise but it is the fact of not only a pre-registration but actually the registration phase of a new round, which has certain consequences in our discussion.

The result is that a completely separate EOI from the round doesn't really make sense because either it is starting before the DAG is sufficiently finalized and then it is in contradiction with the requirement that the round starts when those issues have been solved or it waits until all the issues have solved and then it is just the beginning of the round, which is actually the direction it's taking. Therefore, in this respect what it is pointing towards is that the EOI is necessarily connected to the actual round and if it's connect to the actual round it is actually the first step, so why not focus on how to finalize these elements in the DAG and maybe explore further what the first step in the round can be taking the lessons from the EOI discussion.

Finally, it is important to recall that the GAC has expressed the need for exploring track differentiation in categories and we want to share with you the fact that we intend to further push the idea of having cross community working group or informal working group that will explore this notion of track differentiation to see whether it can be positively contributing and report at least 3 weeks before Brussels so it can feed into the general discussion. Thank you.

Janis:

Thank you Bertrand. Since we are very close to the end of the meeting I think we'll see if the Board members would like to react on the information. Peter, please.

Peter:

Thank you Chair. I'm looking at you Bertrand but I'm not sure this properly goes to you. You will remember Mr. Chairman that the Board was going to consider the EOI at its February meeting and we received a request from the GAC for further time. I think it's only a fair question now to put to the GAC, what have you done with the time we granted you? What has been the processes you used? What is the conclusions you've come to as a result of this extension of time?

Janis:

Thank you peter for the question, we had an opportunity to spend more than an hour on the question of EOI on Sunday where it became relatively clear that the majority of the GAC members present in the meeting expressed skepticism of the usefulness of the EOI taking into account that preparatory work for the launch seems to me that is converging relatively well to the end point.

It was felt that EOI was adding an additional complexity to the process, especially taking into account that there is a sentiment that things are converging rather than resolving problems. It is different from the situation that was Seoul where the perception was everything falls apart. So this is one point.

Another point we had an opportunity to engage with the rest of the community on Monday. We had an opportunity to express our concerns and so I think the Board which will make a decision on Friday during the Board meeting and the Board members who were present in that session will be able to make a decision whatever the decision will be, being much better informed about community sentiments on this.

I think that is the value of not making a rash decision but making a better informed decision.

Peter:

Just a follow up because Mark you didn't mention that as coming in the letter. Is EOI going to form part of your advice to us before Friday?

Mike:

In the communiqué.

Peter:

In the communiqué thank you. Janis I wonder if it would be helpful if I could ask Bruce Tompkin who chaired the working group just to report. I'm particularly interested in the suggestion from Bertrand that there is no consensus. Bruce is there consensus around any aspect of the EOI?

Bruce:

I don't think there is consensus about any aspect of ICANN actually; I think there is always different views. I think some of the things that came out in the discussion of the panel was one, an EOI does give additional information but it's at the expense of an additional step in the process. So some of those who are keen to make things go faster would rather there not be an EOI. Those that want to proceed carefully and that is certainly some of the Board like the idea of additional information step before committing to the final process. So I guess those are the 2 tradeoffs, there is a tradeoff of the additional information versus the additional step and it will naturally lengthen the process.

One of the things that became clear in the session was the timing of when you would start and finish an EOI with respect to how stable the final draft applicant guidebook is. So some were afraid that the EOI might start before the draft applicant guidebook dealt with some of the substantial issues. I think as the Board and others have reiterated that's not the plan. The plan is the draft applicant guidebook should address the actual issues that are being raised so far.

But then the problem is how do you measure the level of consensus on those overarching issues before you can start the EOI. So let's say we published a new draft of the guidebook and say it was June, we'd probably need some measure after we published it to see if there is general support and nobody loudly screaming if you like. Or do we still have the same people screaming really loudly and therefore we haven't really addressed the overarching issues. So it's hard to make that call until we actually publish the next guidebook. So then the question is how long should we wait? What is the timing? Does the EOI start 1, 2, 3 or 4 months, 12 months...I don't think there is clarity around that.

And the 4th aspect is about communication for new GTLD's. Those in developing countries feel that ICANN should start now more broadly communicating about what new GTLD's are. And those in developing nations feel that ICANN doesn't need to do that right now because they already know new GTLD's are happening since June 2008. They're saying don't tell us anymore until you can tell us what the final rules are, how much it will cost and what date.

So there is a different information requirement, if you like, and level of understanding between the developed and developing worlds. And I think that is something else that is emerging that we need to improve outreach in the developing countries about the concept of new GTLD's but at the same time understand that the real value of the communication plan for some of the developed world and especially a lot of the attendees at ICANN is tell us when and how much and what the rules are.

Janis:

Thank you Bruce.

Rod:

First I want to thank all of you for the incredibly valuable information you shared with us today in your continued advisory role. It is very vital to our success. I want to share one last piece of information with you, an observation I feel obligated to share as the CEO of ICANN, particularly under the Affirmations of Commitments, paragraphs 3 and 9.2, which refer to the security of a domain name system.

Paragraph 3 refers to ICANN's role and requirement to preserve the security of a domain name system globally. What I want to share with you as a representative of many countries of the world is that the domain name system is under attack today as it has never been before. I have personally consulted with over 20 CEO's of the top Registries and top Registrars globally, all of whom are seeing increasing attacks and complexity of attacks and who are extremely concerned.

The domain name system is more fragile and vulnerable today than it has ever been. It could stop at any given point in time literally. It has never stopped, it has been slowed down through attacks and the Kominsky exploit that was disclosed only 18 months or so ago could have been used to fundamentally cripple the domain name system. That system is used 1 trillion times per day and your economies depend upon it. It can stop or it can materially be damaged and harmed. It is under attack.

Parts of that system are only in your countries and I'm going to be writing you a letter and asking you for what is happening in the domain name system in your countries because we're seeing new levels of wild carding that is occurring at the telecom service provider level, synthesis of domain name system providers interrupting DNS requests and providing false data and information for commercial or other purposes. But the system is under full scale attack and I am extremely concerned as the CEO of ICANN I want to let you know that.

We're all in this together and I have met with the heads of cyber security or technical infrastructure of 3 of the largest counties on earth who are concerned as well. I'm sharing this because I'm gravely concerned and we need your help. So we're going to be asking you for your advice on domain name security and on the DNS SERT and what can be done and particularly to learn the lessons from you as well. What has been accomplished in your countries?

I have experience with SERTS in several countries but we need to learn more. So that will be coming and I just want to express my concern to this group because I don't want to wait until Brussels. Thank you.

Janis:

Thank you Rod and looking forward to receiving your letter and engaging on this subject. We had today a long session on the issue and we engaged with Greg (last name) and it was very useful conversation. There are some questions, particularly on the financial side of this initiative but certainly GAC members were positive about efforts ICANN deploys in this respect.

So taking into account we are 15 minutes over schedule time and we need to leave the premises, at least according security briefs we received before the meeting, so I would like to bring this session to a close and thank Board members for being present and spending time with the GAC. I would also equally like to thank GAC members for their active participation and the representatives of the community for being present and listening in.

Thank you very much. I believe we will meet next time in Brussels and looking forward to further cooperation.

Peter:

Janis thanks very much and in the interest of time all I will say is yes I agree with what you said. Thank you.