GNSO – ICANN Nairobi Meeting
Joint ccNSO/GNSO Lunch
08 March 2010 at 13:00 local time

Note: The following is the output of transcribing at the joint ccNSO/GNO Lunch held in Nairobi on Monday 08 March at 13:00 Local time. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded. You can start now.

Man: Perhaps we might start down at that end of the table and come back around this way.

Olga Cavalli: Yes

Caroline Greer:

Ron Sherwood: Yes. Good afternoon. Ron Sherwood, ccNSO ALAC liaison.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi Vansnick liaison, ccNSO from ALAC.

(Geo Hazoff):   (Geo Hazoff) from (unintelligible).

(Ivan Degeer):   (Ivan Degeer) from dot.tz registerty

(Alan Hernandez):Alan Hernandez with dot.MW, ccNOS Council

Erick Iriarte Ahon: Erick Iarte, LAC TLD, liaison ccNSO Council

(Oscar Robles): (Oscar Robles) ccTLD for Mexico, (dot MX) and part of the ccNSO Council.

Liz Gasster: Liz Gasster, ICANN Policy Staff.

Wendy Seltzer: Wendy Seltzer, Non-Commercial GNSO counselor.

Rafik Dammak: Rafik Dammak, NSCG GNSO Counselor.

Dotty Sparks: (Dotty Sparks De Blanc), ccTLD.

Bill Drake: Well, this is wonderful. Glen and the staff of the GNSO, they make everything happen. And I am Bill Drake. I am a GNSO Counselor, Non commercial stakeholders.

Stéphane van Gelder: All right. Stéphane van Gelder. I'm a Registrar Stakeholder Group Representative to the GNSO Council.

Chris Disspain: Chris Disspain, .AU and Chair of the ccNSO.

Young-Eum Lee: Young-Eum Lee, dot.kr Vice Chair, ccNSO.

Becky Burr   Becky Burr, ccNSO Council.

Lesley Cowley: That's my neighbor. Good afternoon. Lesley Cowley, .dot.uk, ccNSO Councillor.

Peter van Roster   (Unintelligible) ccNSO Council.

Matthieu Weill: Matthieu Weill, Afnic, (unintelligible) ccNSO Member and (unintelligible).

Ondrej Filip: Ondrej Filip, dot.cz and ccNSO Council.

Byron Holland: Byron Holland, dot.ca), Vice Chair, ccNSO.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, GNSO Counselor from the (ISP).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Sorry.

Debra Hughes: Good afternoon. My name is Debra Hughes. I am with the American Red
                   Cross and part of the GNSO and CSG.

Stephane van Gelder: So hello, everyone. It's always a pleasure to meet with the ccNSO. Chris
                   and I thought we might just start by explaining why Chuck's not speaking to
                   you and I am. And then just going over quickly the current GNSO structure, it
                   just changed recently as you all know, but we thought it might be useful just
                   to remind you what the new structure looks like.

                   So first of all for reasons that have been much debated in the last few days.
                   Some members of the GNSO community were unable to make it to this
                   meeting. Chuck is one of them, the Chair of the GNSO Counsel. I am the
                   Vice Chair - one of the two Vice Chairs, the other being Olga Cavalli. And as
                   such I'm standing in for Chuck for this meeting. Olga is also - for personal
                   reasons was also unable to make it to this meeting. I know she's very sorry
                   about that.

                   And so just to go over the new bicameral structure for the council, there is
                   now twin house structure. On the one hand we have the non-contracted
                   party's house which includes - and I hope I'm not going to get this wrong,
                   because I'm actually the only representative of the contracted party's house
                   that's in Nairobi.

                   So I've been laboring under this minority position for the past two days and I
                   can get pretty horrible looks from my counterparts in the non-contracted
                   party's house.

So anyways, the NCSG, the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group and then there are some constituencies in that house. The IPC, Intellectual Property Constituency, the Business Constituency and the ISP, Internet Service Providers Constituency.

And I believe we have representatives of all those groups in the room. I'm looking around the - I don't know, so Heath's not here, so the BC's not represented. So he's actually still in that (ELI) panel I think. That's the non-contracted party's side of the house.

Welcome, Andre, another GNSO Counselor. That should even up the numbers a little bit. And on the contracted side we have two groups, the Registrees and the Registrars. So that's the basic make up. I'm happy to answer any further questions you may have. I don't want to label the new GNSO structure anymore. (Unintelligible) discussion, yeah.

So we prepared two subjects for today. One of them I'm hopelessly unqualified to discuss with you, because we were counting on Edmon Chung which is - Edmon Chung is working with some of you on the JIG and we were planning to discuss that.

Now I know, Andre - I'm looking around, because I just saw him, but now he's disappeared again. I know he - there you are. He's qualified to discuss it, so maybe we can still have that discussion. It's up to you.

We also wanted to discuss the acclimation of commitments. We can start with that and I suggest we can discuss any other things as well that we may want to talk about.

Does someone from the council want to lead that discussion - the GNSO Counsel, sorry. Perhaps the question is, what would the GNSO Council...

((Crosstalk))

Stephane van Gelder: We were - we hadn't set specific questions. We wanted to have an open discussion with you on what the AoC means for you and what it means for us. Just to find out if we have common ground. If we have the same views, we have diverging views. If we have the same level of understanding of what it means. So it's an open discussion. No exact questions there.

Chris Disspain: Okay. Let me start by saying, giving my personal view which is actually the affirmation of commitment itself is not desperately, I mean it's there, it exists , its not a negotiating document, it's not open for drafting changes. It is what it is.

What flows from that however apart from amorphous things like changes in behavior and so on which may or may not occur, what flows from that are now a whole series of reviews. And I think perhaps that might be quite an interesting area for discussion.

I know that the call for volunteers if you will, closed yesterday and I believe that the lists now are going to be considered. I don't know if you're aware - I have - I actually spoke to some of my council yesterday and I had actually forgotten to send them a copy of this but the Chairs of the the GNSO Counsel, the ALAC and ccNSO wrote to Rod and Peter and (Yanis), expressing our concerns about several facts.

One of which was the process that each of our supporting organizations or advisory committees actually have processes in place by which we choose people to do stuff. And this particular process that was just put in place on an ad hoc basis, effectively forced us into a situation where we had to go outside of our own well worn and well honed processes in order to provide them with a series of volunteers.

There were several other points made about timing - the usual ones about timing, et cetera and also the irony of the facts that the first review is on

accountability and transparency and the process is neither accountable nor transparent.

So just so that you know where we are on this, I know that you guys have put forth a number of volunteers. We asked - we had no process for arranging for volunteers. What we did was simply tell everybody that they might like to volunteer and then once we knew who they were we would presumably be asked whether we endorse them or not.

And as of yesterday we actually had precisely zero volunteers, but as of the close of business yesterday we have one. So it's pretty fair bet that our one person will be the (one) who represents the ccNSO.

Now we actually have to - I guess we have to go through a process on that at our counsel meeting on Wednesday, formally endorsing that volunteer, but presuming that, that's not an issue. So I mean, we really - I mean speaking personally I'm very uncomfortable about this whole thing it's really not good at all.

Stephane van Gelder: Yeah. I think we share a lot of your concerns. Speaking purely from a registrar point of view, it's been tough for us to even within the timeline to even get any process forwarded where se can approve or start to even consider some of the volunteers.

Now I believe Bill's going to speak to this, because he's our point man on this. But I believe we have 10 volunteers from the - is that correct - from the GNSO.

And the problem for us then is to go back to our stakeholder groups and constituencies and try and within that short time frame get a process together where we can approve them. So that really is creating a challenge. I think we're finding the same problems that you...

Chris Disspain: You presumably would have to go through a process of endorsing - you would go through a process of endorsing a number of them, but the problem is of course you don't know how many you need.

And so therefore you could end up fighting over - you can end up spending an awful lot of time fighting over say endorsing five people only to discover that in fact you only needed one or two. Because they don't know the numbers and I'm told the current situation is that there is still no answer to that question.

They are - some who think it should be a small group of about eight in total. Obviously not 8 GNSO, but 8 total. And others who believe that it should be about 12 or 13 and no decision has yet been made.

Stephane van Gelder: Bill, do you want to speak to this?

Bill Drake: Sure. Bill Drake. So I was - am the Chair of the drafting team that put together the GNSO process for managing this election nominations. I'm also on what we've called an evaluation team which will be looking at the pool of candidates that are open to competitive election and providing an assessment of them to the council prior to its vote on those positions.

Let me just lay out briefly the topography. I really just want to say one thing, Chris, the one candidate you have - one of the ambiguities actually in the documents as I read them - it's not entirely obvious to me whether the selectors are bound to accept the (names) we put forward.

Chris Disspain: Yes, you are correct. It was not entirely obvious that they are bound to select a representative from say the ccNSO. However you can pretty much rest assure that they don't

((Crosstalk))

Chris   It would not be a wise thing to do.

Bill Drake: It'd be politically unwise...

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: Looking at the total global mix that we're trying to deal with...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: ...to do that, yes, but then that makes...

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: I'm sure that this challenge Peter and Janis will have is trying to get an overall balance in place that they think that the international community won't go, "Oh my God how did you settle on that?"

((Crosstalk))

Bill: ...the measure diversity and distribution across stake holding groups and interest and...

Chris Disspain: I think that's true, but I - I think that's true, but I would argue that by launching a process that have been effectively a requirement for each candidate to be endorsed by, a SO or (AC) with a fairly heavy implication in there that you expect that to be right across...

Bill Drake: I agreeI was only taking note of one of the many delicious ambiguities that we labored under. The process for the GNSO defining a mechanism is of course complicated by the fact that the timelines kept changing, the date by which we had to do things were up in the air for a long time and then went back and forth and so we had to recalibrate...

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: ...able to settle on something, but here's the bottom line if you're interested. I'll make it very brief. We set up a process where by we could put forward up to six names. Each of our four stakeholder groups gets allocated one sixth person whose name will go into the pool from the GNSO.

Then we have two other slots. One of which is reserved for people who are unaffiliated with any stakeholder group independance you know, law professors or something like that who know a lot about ICANN, but don't work within the different bodies or some other kind of expert on accountability transparencies, something like that. Or somebody who simply says, I don't identify with any of these stakeholder groups. So there's that category.

And there's another category and then there's another category which is a kind of competitive category for which each of the stakeholder groups can nominate up to two people.

So we're looking at - we have a pool of 10 right now. Four of those would be allocated to the stakeholder groups, six then will be up for contention in the two competitive slots. Those slots would be selected on the basis of majority of both houses. If nobody gets the majority of both houses, we'll try to give it a second go.

And if we can't get anything then I guess we'll just have to live with having regional consensus on that. We are also trying hard - do whatever we can to get gender and geographical diversity and we touch some requirements into our process to that end. Of course the limitation there is the nature of the pool that you get in the first place. As it happens, of the ten applicants we received only one is a woman.

So it makes our gender diversity goal a little bit hard to fully operationalize. We do however have some internationality in our mix, among some of the stakeholder group's nominees, on the other hand other stake holder groups have basically just nominated white guys from the United States which makes it a little harder.

So we have to figure out how to balance all those things out. And so what we will do is on constituency day hopefully or soon there after the stakeholder groups will (pour) our their preferences and notify the (unintelligible) the evaluation team will pick the remaining issues and we will have a vote in counsel on the 16 of (unintelligible) and hopefully we have six names at the end of that.

Man: You know thanks very much. Go (Leslie).

(Lesley):   Yeah. Thank you. I (unintelligible) comment this selection of the reviewers being very late and rushed and doesn't seem to take account of the processes within the community, but doing that in a more considered timely fashion. And there is an element of hindsight with those comments.

Literally from that I'm looking forward to the reviewers coming up to the draft report. And notice in the concentration they talk about the draft report appearing in October of this year and the final report may actually being produced in December of this year.

And having a bit of foresight I would say, does that actually allow for the normal consideration processes that we might have within the community in order to reflect on the report recommendations. So maybe we could focus some attention on actually getting that saved to this process, much better at underlying (do) communication consideration on the report in a more considered and timely fashion.

Chris Disspain: Can I just check on what you said? You were saying that you think that the - once we've got the review team that the process for coming up with their final report is to short, because it won't - it doesn't seem to allow for the usual community discussions and input on the floor.

(Lesley): This is feeling rushed, doesn't allow for our normal processes.

Man: Yeah.

(Lesley): I (happily) predict the end of this process will be the same and that we proactively make it otherwise.

Chris Disspain: (Unintelligible) Yes I mean I agree with that. I think there is a danger of this whole thing being squashed into a very small box and yeah.

Stephane van Gelder: Are any of the people on line - do any of them want to comment? We don't have - just to let those people know we don't have the Adobe screen up. So actually if you put your hand up we won't see it. So you might want to speak up if you do. Yeah Bart's got it open on his computer, but we don't have it open.

Just to - I don't think there's anyone coming in on the line.

Man: No.

Chris Disspain: Okay. Just to let you know that unless Cheryl and our Chuck have received a reply and accidently my name was left off the envelope then we haven't received a reply. And we - one of the first things, so that we invariably do on assess day - Tuesday meetings is have a meeting with the Chair and the CEO and this is one of the items that is on the discussion agenda for that meeting to find out what the situation is.

Because one of the other concerns that we expressed in the letter if I remember (correctly) was that it seems to be that this pool of people is supposed to be the pool of people for all of the reviews which is complete nonsense. This pool of people is the pool of people for all of the reviews. It's not? It is just for this one, okay. Well maybe I misunderstood then.

Stephane van Gelder Yeah you touch on one of the challenges that we have once again, specifically for this meeting which is we normally also meet with at least (Peter) and yeah, Bart. Okay we'll get to Chuck in just five seconds. We normally meet with Peter, Rod and Senior ICANN staff during our constituency days and that's going to be a challenge, because most of our constituents here for this meeting are physically present in the room.

So that will once again add complexities there. And one of those touch, you know, touching on those subjects is going to be difficult when people aren't actually physically here and able to participate as much as they could or they might have been if they were here.

Although one has to say that we found, because of the GNSO Counsel meets on the Saturday and Sunday before each ICANN meeting. We've had nothing but, you know, good experiences with the remote participation so far. And I'm sure Chuck will be able to confirm that now. And he's on the line.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Thank you. Sorry I was a little later. I - the EOI session was going way over and so I had to switch rooms here in (Reston). With regard to which review team this is for, I fully understand that the request for applicants was for all review teams and in fact some of the requests that have requested GNSO endorsement have been for more than just the first review.

But I wanted to clarify that the GNSO, just for our purposes is only focusing on the first review team, the one on accountability and transparency. Because we did not want have to such as rushed process, as was required for this one to apply to the other review teams.

So our focus in the GNSO and I'm just speaking for the GNSO right now. And Bill knows this well is really right now on the accountability and transparency review team. And we - our plans are to do a more thorough job of developing a process for endorsement of candidates for the other review teams. Thank you.

Bill Drake??   Thank you, Chuck. Yes and just further to Chuck's point, the process that we've set for this one was somewhat (fee to the pants) and we recognized it is essentially a one time model. We're going to test it, see what lessons we learn from it.

We're going to revised and establish in April or hopefully May at the latest - a permanent model for how we're going to hand excessive rounds of review teams going forward. There will be - I can't all for applicants. It's a little bit ambiguous I think and probably registered confusion.

Some people did apply and say, I'm not really interested in this particular review team. I'm interested in the future one. And those cases we had to sort of put those aside and say okay, we'll look at this person later. But since very few people actually applied for the subsequent one, logically we're going to have to come back again and do another call at a more appropriate time, after there's been some experience.

And hopefully more people will have - by that point cluster together and identify, okay we want to work on this area of stability and we'll have a conference call for that and then do the (competition) then (unintelligible). I think that there was a little bit of messiness with the first round, but there will be successful rounds.

Chris Disspain: Thank you. I understand that, but that is based on your understanding that you would have the opportunity - I'm sorry there would be an opportunity for calls for volunteers for the next review.

And my reading of it was that this was the call for volunteers first up. And that this is now the call and when the next review kicks off people are taken from that pool. Now Chuck, was that your understanding as well?

Chuck Gomes: Well yes, Chris. I do - I did understand the request for volunteers to be for all of them. We just decided in the GNSO that we - we're not going to look for volunteers for the other review teams and even if they're submitted now until we develop a more comprehensive process in that regard.

Chris Disspain: Thanks you and I - Thank you, Chuck and I agree with that. And what I suppose I'm saying is that we need to make sure that the GNSO, the ccNSO, the ALAC, actually make it abundantly clear that as far as we're concerned this is it for this one and it does not mean that you will simply be able to carry on. You will have to do another one otherwise we will just not accept that.

Chuck Gomes: Now Chris, if I can respond to that. I think we should talk a little bit more and we don't necessarily have to do that right now. We should talk a little bit more about how long the application process is for the other review teams, because and I'm speaking for myself now, because we haven't really talked about this extensively in the broader GNSO community.

I personally would not be opposed if there were subsequent requests - volunteers for the reviews that are going to happen later. In fact I actually think that would be better to get it out of this rushed process that is so flawed right now.

Chris Disspain: Yeah. I agree.

Stephane van Gelder: (Unintelligible) did you want to say something? (Unintelligible) please speak now if you want to. I mean, you know, apart from saying that we fully agreed with Chuck has just said, there's not much else to say. So go ahead.

Oscar Robles: I haven't understood yet if there's going to be a call for the other reviews and that my comment is that there should be different groups, because Europe - and they require a different set of (keys) for their reviewing of their issues.

Chris Disspain: Thanks, Oscar and I think that, that is what we're beginning to hear isn't understanding that, that is the message we will all be delivering and by whatever methodology we choose to ICANN, any other comments on this particular bit or should we move on to the nice technical subject? We have - you and I should probably lead.

Man: Yeah, (unintelligible).

Stephane van Gelder: Probably don't have a cup of coffee, but the point that we've written down. This was working with Edmon was asking the question of what will be requested and publicly displayed in the IANA who is for IDN TLDs and having said that I'm still trying to understand the question. So (Andre), do you want to - can I talk you to that.

Chris Disspain: Andre, just before you do, can I just set the background I think, so you know the context in which we're talking. The ccNSO and the GNSO agreed sometime ago that we thought it would be a nice idea to set up a joint working group to look at any issues on IDNs that were sort of cross over issues.

And it took us quite a while to get that sorted out. And in fact that working group does exist. It's co-chaired by Edmon and by (Jiane), neither of whom are with us today.

And there has been a little bit of discussion with - amongst the chairs about what is - what are the cross over issues and what is relevant. And Edmon had asked that - Edmon has suggested that the information to be put into who is - was a cross over issue and my - I must say my response to that was, you know, it didn't actually, because everyone at our ccTLD had their own

(unintelligible) and we have our own rules and regulations. So that was quite an interesting topic. So I'm (unintelligible).

Andrei Kolesnikov: Thank you very much - that there are few things actually - significant things kind of happened over our (unintelligible) the JIG workgroup has been formed and that have been kind of slow for a simple reason, because the center of the discussion has moved to the international registration data.

And (Admin) unfortunately is not on line is spending lots of his time and his knowledge about the international data included in the international data registration group basically which is really actually working and delivering results.

There has been a few basic questions, first of all the discussions flat for - into two directions obviously one being technical direction on, you know, basic who is principal and the second one which in my experience was (east) of the most important is actually what's being displayed into the WHOIS services and there are a lot of things. I mean its - I'm actively involved in this discussion and it seems we have - we (unintelligible) introduction of the IDN gTLDs.

The (guide) along tower - I don't know how to say in English, you know, there is a speak a language now that the lessons script which is (basement) the core of the Internet addressing in the WHOIS - actively using in the WHOIS data is going to be less and less feasible and more and more international characters will be used for the displaying.

Including the WHOIS data and it's fine, it's great, it means that we have a diversity, but we also have to keep in mind that we have to somehow keep the people on certain tendered level, at least to find the track of who owns the domain and, you know, this kind of basic thing.

And it's an active discussion that is going on and we know that in the fast track the four applicants already had approval for their IDN ccTLDs and the question of who is data an what's the display, is actually approaching us. It's, you know, this questions - a couple of questions we should be resolved fairly soon.

Chris Disspain: Can I just clarify, just so that we're absolutely clear. Are you talking about the data for the display in the IANA database or are you talking about the data that is displayed by the registry in their own WHOIS

Andrei Kolesnikov The registry and the data of the domain and the IANA

Chris All of them.

Andrei All of them. It's a set of questions.

Chris So the IANA stuff

Andrei The (IM) staff is a (giek) - is actually the working group which performed...

Man: Yes.

Andrei: ...for you know, for the ccNSO and GNSO to have a common ground of, you know, the display (unintelligible). But I think as soon as it's limited set of data I don't there will be a problem with that, but as I said Edmon and (unintelligible) in the internalization have moved into the, you know, moved forward - most further with the issues of internationilization sorry.

Stephane Are you looking at what the existing - you mentioned the four countries that have already applied for IDN ccTLDs, one of them being Russia I believe.

Andrei: Yeah.

Stephane   Are you looking at what they - the solutions that they have started to implement. I believe Russia's already in the launch process. So that work has got to have been done by them.

Andrei: Yeah we do have WHOIS, that's already working in Cyrillic, but we've decided to keep the latin script, therefore a while until we have a universal solution agreed by everybody.

Chris: So your WHOIS is in Cyrillic and latin

Man: The (Cyrillic field we have the new field and who is out would call the IDN.

Man: Right.

Andrei: So IDN is a real Cyrillic unit code name which goes out...

Chris: But the actual data of the registrant that's all going to be in ASKE.

((Crosstalk))

Stephane: Is that something that you think should be a recommendation. That, that system be adopted for both IDN and cc's and g's?

Man: Not necessarily. First of all it should not be stictly regulated, number one, especially in the GNSO world. Second there are certain activities behind, you know, the main WHOIS out, especially the law enforcement agencies and legal people, supposedly some connection to the common script should be maintained in all they IDN world.

                At least some anchor services were in case of trouble or in case of when somebody needs to find some information using what's called the universal script which is (ASKE) should be maintained. That's my recommendation for based on the common things. Thank you.

Chris: I think you'll find - I think you might find that you'll be agreed with by a lot of international law enforcement agencies who would probably find it quite difficult to look up domain name registration information in Arabic of Cyrillic. Anyone else on this particular point?

Okay I have one more thing I'd just like to ask if anyone wants on the gTLD side wants to talk about which you all know that the government advisory committee and the ccNSO have for quite some considerable time now been talking about as these geographic names, specifically country and territory names, as in the gTLD world.

And the composition as far as I can recall outside of things is that we have once again risen to the board and asked if they could please actually respond to the letter wrote in the last time and so on. I was wondering if anybody would like to talk about what they think the current GNSO position is on country.

I'm not talking about Berlin's and Sydneys, I am talking about Australia's and France's.

Stephane van Gelder: So we hadn't planned on discussing this, so I don't think during our discussions over the past few days we agreed on any consensus position. We have discussed this in the past and we did actually discuss this in our joint session with the GAC yesterday where the GAC reaffirmed their opinion and belief that the current geographical, the current rules for protection of geographic names don't go far enough.

I think the - once again perhaps I may speak - give my own opinion rather than speak for the GNSO. My opinion is that what has been included in the DAG certainly at the top level is fairly comprehensive level of protection for Geo names.

Geo names can be considered the third category in the (DAG) beyond the standard and community TLDs. They are clearly outlined as such. There's preference given for country, city, region names and with different levels of preference. And we feel - I feel sorry that, that level of protection goes far enough.

There's also the question of the level of protection and for all the Geo names at the second level which opens up a whole new can or worms. And I'm sure some of my colleagues would like to speak to that so I don't get into any more trouble.

Chris Disspain: Can I just say I wasn't looking for a position. I was simply - it's just a topic for discussion. One of the great things about these is we want you to - we can all kind of just talk.

Jamie Wagner My name is I'm from the ISP Constituency in GNSO. But I would like to - just to add that I think the GAC answered much more from the second level than on the first level. I think that the gTLD level it might.

(Unintelligible) that present moves are enough, but there is still work for assurance to do at a second level. And I would like to bring a discussion - there aren't - I think it's .info that asks for two character at the second level to and this is not only new gTLDs, old gTLDs also present some risk to this golden rule that I thought was set.

Stephane van Gelder: Yeah, just to clarify that. The federal existing gTLD operator's registry operators have requested to be able to sell the register - open up for registration names that - the two in one characters in some cases.

So obviously I believe Chris maybe you know more about this than I do. But I believe that when they have done so they've worked with ICANN to ensure the protection reported all the existing country codes.

Chris Disspain: Yeah. That's correct. And the issue of geographic names at the second level is quite an interesting one, because - and I - I'm speaking personally and this is an assumption on my part is based partly on personal experience.

The issue of geographic names at the second level is often characterized of a public service in a particular country as a work issue, because the last thing they want to have to do is provide whatever registry with a list of how ever many geographic names that need to be reserved. And they - those is my head, you know, you did it once, you've done it, you don't' just do it again. But apparently that doesn't work.

So there's an issue if we don't want to have to doing all of this and it would be much easier if it simply didn't happen in the first place. Our position is slightly different I think, our concern is very much at the top level and it's because we think that part of the argument is being well looked. If the government of Australia says - actually we'd like dot.Australia and we're happy to have that as a gTLD.

And it goes to Aus registry and says to be the registry and other deal in this registry dot. Australia. And one argument is where that should be fine because the government in Australia has said that, that is what they would like as a gTLD. But the challenges around that I - we - I think would argue many.

They include that government's change on a fairly regular basis. And they - this then become a political football. You end up in a circumstance where you might be getting re-delegation requests, simply because the governments changed. It is recognizable as a country name.

It's - there is also, because the issue that - and I'm not suggesting that this would happen Australia, but if the issue is the government of Australia might simply say, yes we know we've signed a contract, but quite frankly we don't

care. And we're just going to tear it up and what are you going to do? Take it away from us.

So there all sorts of challenges around that politically which we think are quite dangerous. And therefore until those things have been really thought through and I mean really, really thought through they should probably be a reservation.

Lesley: Just adding on that point. The ccNSO has a working group considering whether a policy development process needs to be undertaken for delegation and re-delegation in the cc context, many of the issues that we would (unintelligible) decision to go and developed PDP with respect to country name would be relevant at the G level if we're talking about country names.

Man: Thanks.

Lesley: And I can tell you as well (its not going to be a simple task

Stéphane van Gelder: But it's useful to know that. I mean it will certainly be very interesting for us to follow your work on that. I see that Chuck, you have your hand raised.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Stéphane. I want to go back. Stéphane was correct in saying that the GNSO hasn't recently discussed the geographic main issue, for that matter the two character - single character issue, but I want to go back to the gTLD PDP process where we did discuss that - both of those issues extensively.

And develop positions and also positions for geographic names at the comp level. In fact they had a reserve names working groups that was a sub working group to the gTLD process that spent a lot of time discussions these issues and I'll cover each of them in terms of the recommendations. First of all let's go to the top level geographic names.

The GNSO actually did not recommend reserving country names, but instead as most of you know recommended we have a dispute process by which and government and have standing to object if a name was applied for. Okay now as everyone knows, staff implementation plans wend beyond the GNSO recommendation and has recommended that those geographic names and certain defined categories not be allowed.

And so we're all aware of that. Then we'll just leave that at that point with regard to second level geographic names. There was not any recommendation from the GNSO that there be any geographic name reservation. And so the GNSO's position from the new gTLD process and that was developed from the special reserved names working group, those not to reserve any geographic names at the second level.

So what the GAC has now and has been for some time requesting for the GNSO position has in very different and I'll - so we're not in sync there unless there would be a development in the GNSO to reverse that position. I don't think that's too likely, but that's just an historical update there which we essentially also jumped into two character and single character names at the second level.

Again the reserve names working group and ultimately the full counsel and its recommendations on new gTLDs did not certainly recommended that the - that efforts be made by any registry operators to avoid conflicts with country code top level domains, but other than that did not restrict single and two character names.

And like Stéphane pointed out, several registries have put forward registry services and all of those to date I think have been approved by the board to offer single and two character names at the second level. So I think I covered all of the things that have been brought up here.

Again these aren't recent discussions of the GNSO like Stéphane pointed out, but rather they were an extensive part of the discussion that were part of the new gTLD process and in particular the reserve names working group. Thanks.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks very much, Chuck. Would anyone else like to say a word about (unintelligible) or are we ready to bring this meeting to a close.

Chris Disspain: Okay. So thank you very much in deed everybody. Thanks to those on line and we go upstairs in about 10 minutes for the next one. Thanks.

END