
BUENOS AIRES – GAC with Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC)

Sunday, November 17, 2013 – 16:30 to 18:00

ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Okay. If everyone can please be seated.

Okay. I think we are about ready to start.

Okay. So first let me thank the Board New gTLD Program Committee for coming to meet with us today. We have had a chance in the GAC to talk a bit about some of the issues or concerns or points that we would like to raise with you in our exchange today. They are focused on category 1 and 2, and the various responses and information that you have provided to us around how you intend to move forward in implementing the GAC's advice.

So my take-away from the GAC's discussions is that we are wanting to raise some questions or make some proposals and so on, all in the spirit of continuing to move the process along and to allow the NGPC to continue in their efforts to implement the category 1 and two safeguards.

So I will ask a number of our colleagues to raise questions and make comments and so on, but before that, is there anything that, Cherine, as chair of the NGPC, you would like to say from the

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

outset or shall we just move to taking in some reaction from the GAC?

CHERINE CHALABY: No, let's move. Let's get on with it. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Great. Okay.

So some of the points that we want to raise relate to the contents of the list. So we'll start with category 1. So the contents of the list in terms of what's considered to be highly regulated versus not highly regulated sectors. And on that point, I will turn to the EU Commission. I can't see where they're seated.

Okay. All right. So their request was to take five strings and move them into the highly regulated sectors column. So I will read them as follows: health, healthcare, doctor, finance, and financial.

And as I understood the comments from the U.S., you had made a comment on the health-related strings as well? You had not. Okay. Fine.

So if you would like to react to that now, or we can continue identifying -- yeah. Please, go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

So good afternoon, everybody. My name is Chris Disspain. I'm a member of the NGPC.

I'm not -- I'm not proposing to get into a deep discussion about individual strings. We've taken a long time to come to our current position.

If I could give you a specific example from the list that's just been read, two maybe. With respect to doctor, you will have noticed that the string dentist is on the regulated side of the list, and the string -- or highly regulated side of the list, and the string doctor is not on the highly regulated side of the list. And the reason for that, in our thinking -- sorry, can you not hear me? I apologize. I don't often get told to speak louder, but thank you.

Our thinking behind that was simply that whereas the term dentist is truly limited to dentists, the term doctor is not limited to health doctors. It's a term that replies to doctors of all sorts of different areas, including music, philosophy, and various other academic qualifications. So our view on that was that it wasn't highly regulated.

In the same way, we looked at health and decided that there are all sorts of unregulated market sectors in many, many countries that promote themselves in respect to health. So all I can really say to you is that the list that we had come to has come from a

significant amount of discussion and consideration. I mean, I'll happily answer specific questions.

And of course, let me be really clear. If we receive consensus advice from the GAC in respect to a particular string or a number of strings, we will take that into consideration in accordance with the bylaws and how we deal with GAC advice.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you for that.

So I see our colleagues have joined us from the EU Commission, so I was just starting off by raising the comments that you had made earlier that there are five strings that you would propose be moved into the highly regulated sectors column. And what I have heard Chris provide a reply on, using the example of doctor and why doctor is not considered to be highly regulated and dentist is, is to provide some further insight into how they viewed those particular strings.

Are there any comments or is there a response that you would like to provide to the NGPC on that? Or further -- Yeah, please.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Just a small remark. Thank you, chair.

In other languages, like in French, dot medicin there's no confusability in that regard. Dot medicin is always for doctors. I understand that in English that string might refer to other categories, like academic qualifications like it was mentioned by the Board.

But we consider that in this particular case, it is very sensitive, and it should be regarded as highly regulated, especially because consumers do respect that behind a dot doctor there is, indeed, a reliable and -- a reliable service.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you.

I see Switzerland asking.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: And if I can add to what I just mentioned -- sorry. We said that that it was a non-exhaustive list. So even though dot medicin is not on the list, it could be added in the future.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you.

Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you, and hello to everybody.

With regard to dot doctor, of course it's true that this is not purely targeted to the health field. But, actually, all kinds of doctors are regulated, because you normally need a degree by university. So it's something that could actually be quite easily verified.

And there's quite some abuse with doctor's degree. I just recall the case of a German minister who had to give back his doctor title because he was proved to have cheated when doing his thesis. And this is only one example. There are several others.

So it's actually quite easy to verify. And I think it's not the point whether it's doctors only in the medical field, but there should be a clear requirement for all that apply under doctor, no matter what the scientific areas where they got the degree, that a degree is necessary. And if it turns out that somebody doesn't have a degree, then he shouldn't be able to put himself under myname.doctor, for instance.

So I think it's not an issue of health or not. It's an issue of regulated or not.

Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. And I appreciate that. There were other areas in respect to doctors where we -- in many, many countries, the term "doctor" is used as a name of businesses. A computer doctor. If you -- There are often -- It's a term that is used. It's not a regulated term. It's a term that is used in business names, in company names for people who fix things. And there is no prohibition on the use of that term. It is an open term. And the reason is because it's actually a medical doctor, and the -- I mean, there are all sorts of reasons.

But let me reiterate that we are more than happy to -- if we receive advice from the GAC in respect to any of the individual strings that are currently on the side of the list that is less regulated, if we receive advice to move those to the other side of the list, we will treat that advice in the same way that we treat all GAC advice and we'll take it very seriously.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you.

U.K., a follow-up on this?

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, yes. Just briefly. A question on dot doctor.

There are three applications for dot doctor, yeah? Are they all health related? Can you remind me? I can't recall.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

I don't know. Does anyone know?

No?

I'll happily provide you with -- or we will happily provide you with a response to that as soon as possible but I don't know the answer to that question.

UNITED KINGDOM:

I mean, my thinking is -- just to come back in quickly. My thinking is that when we're talking about safeguards, we should really have in mind what the main purpose of these applications are to determine whether they are -- come within the highly regulated bracket, if that makes sense.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. Okay. I think we can move on to the next item.

So from the U.S., I believe there was some implementation questions that you wanted to put to the NGPC, and then what you were describing as some omissions from the safeguards. So if you

can just take us through those, and then we can invite a response from the NGPC.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. And I'm happy to do this.

We will also, most likely, be following up in writing, but we wanted to take advantage of this opportunity to share with GAC colleagues and, of course, our Board colleagues and the broader community the results of some of our thinking, our analysis, our assessment.

But let me step back a pace and first thank you very much for the considerable amount of work and thought that went into your responses to us at the end of October. I mean, clearly there is an enormous amount of work that has gone on, and I wanted to express our appreciation for all of that.

We are not saying anything here that I think would be earth shattering. Hopefully it isn't, as you listen to it, but we had some questions that we will be seeking a little more clarity.

Whatever you can provide today is obviously very, very welcome.

With regard to category 1 safeguards and the placement of safeguards in public interest commitments, it is not entirely clear to us -- apologies if we're not reading things properly -- whether

the safeguards become mandatory. So that's something we would like a better understanding.

We have reviewed some of the material that's been posted. And I will confess it is not entirely clear to us. We have the three different parts, and we just have a question mark there.

Also, obviously, the idea has come up -- the public dispute resolution process -- right? -- has been proposed. And there aren't a lot of details as to how that will work. And that is something that we would certainly welcome a little more information as to how that will work. I don't know who it was. Maybe that was Australia. I don't mean to steal your thunder, Australia. But there also was a question about standing for governments to use the process. So, on that one, just to really put down a marker that a lot more detail would be very, very welcome.

And there were just a few changes that the board made. And I think you've done a very good job of trying to explain to us exactly what motivated you. We still feel that it's worth flagging that we think there are a couple omissions. So, for example, in omitting reference to recognized industry standards, that strikes us as though something that really could, hopefully, go back in. The term "recognized" for us -- when you say recognized independent standards, it indicates a certain threshold of acceptance by

relevant stakeholders. So, if you are to look at some of these strings that represent certain sectors, professional sectors, whether it's architect, lawyer, bank, et cetera, there are in those sectors, recognized industry standards. So we just thought it's something that you might want to rethink.

We also believe that they -- the way you have determined to treat the requirement or our recommendation that you require verification and validation of credentials. It would be useful if you could review that again, the arguments you have proposed to explain why there's a softening of that. Because we're very, very mindful of the fact that in the current DNS system, there's quite a lot of experience with validating and verifying credentials and that there is quite a lot of willingness. So, depending on different applications or different strings, there are some sort of proactive proposals to verify and validate.

So we'd urge you to kind of revisit that, if we could. Are we stopping here, Madam Chair, at category 1? Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Okay. So --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Want me to respond to that?

CHAIR DRYDEN: Yes, Chris, if you can respond to those.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Suzanne, thank you. With regard to the first one, are the safeguards mandatory? The answer is yes. The rest of it, I hope you'll understand, is just -- you've just thrown those across the table, so I'm not in a position to respond right now. And I would -- I note that you said you were planning to -- the U.S. was planning to write to us. So I'll be very happy to provide input and explanation to you. We'll be happy to do that.

But, when it comes to the first question, are the safeguards mandatory, the answer is yes. The whole point is whichever side of the line you're on, 1 to 3 are mandatory. And, if you're on the - - what we're calling the heavily regulated side of the line, then 4 to 8. 1 to 3 and 4 to 8 are mandatory. So, yes, they are mandatory.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Okay. Did anyone want to raise a point related to these issues? Okay. So let's keep moving through. Australia, please.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair.

Just wanted to add voice to what my U.S. colleague said about thanks to the NGPC. There's a huge amount of work that's gone into this. And it really is appreciated. I think it's a very positive and encouraging and welcome response to the GAC's advice.

And, just to clarify my colleague from the U.S. was talking about stealing my thunder or stealing my question, the question relates to one that's been asked of ICANN a few times which relates to will governments have standing under the PIC DRP to raise concerns on behalf of their constituents? I've -- it may be just me not being able to understand it, but I'm not clear.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you. And thanks for reiterating that point.

I'm not sure if there is -- Akram, do we have an answer to that now with respect to government standing under the PIC resolution process? You want to just grab a microphone maybe?

AKRAM ATALLAH:

Yes. We are in the final process of finalizing the PIC DRP. And we'll put it out. I'll actually put it out for public view and information. We'll finalize that shortly. We'll come back with any specific answers in writing to the GAC.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. But I think -- that's fine. I think that it's a straightforward, you know, question that we need to try to get an answer to as quickly as we can. So that would be very helpful. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Okay. So, U.K., you had a point you wanted to make on that? Or are we moving to your query from earlier? Yeah, go ahead, please.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Online safety for children is a big issue in the U.K. at the moment. It's the subject of government proposals. And child protection experts in the U.K. are also following the new gTLDs program and the submission of applications for domains, top-level domains relating to children, targeting children, and so on. And we listed those in the communique in Beijing, as you will recall.

And that has been the subject of the general advice on safeguards. And I well recognize that.

But I would value a summary so I can report back to my minister and also to child protection experts in the U.K. We have a stakeholder committee on that area working closely with government on child protection online. And I'd like to go back

with some confidence that ICANN is implementing effective safeguards relating to the examples of applications that we listed in our non-exhaustive list. And so I'd be grateful for a kind of summary of where you think you are in implementing the safeguards relating to children and whether you are aware of other proposals that have been submitted, including one which relates to linking safeguards to compliance with the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child. That's one proposal that's been discussed. And, indeed, there was an event relating to that proposal at the European Parliament. And so I would be -- as I say, appreciate some reaction from you for that particular proposal.

And, as I say, generally, the sense of where you are in ensuring that what ICANN can contribute to online safety in line with the wide number of initiatives in this area, the ITU child online protection program and the commonwealth toolkit on child protection online. And so I hope ICANN can reassure me that they are really seized of the criticality of this issue and the particular vulnerabilities that need to be avoided, the major risks that need to be avoided with the delegation of domain names which are specifically targeting the children's market and where data relating to child -- children is going to be created and managed by a registry.

So some sort of sense of overview that you're confident, that what is being done is sufficient to avoid any risks and whether with specific reference to this proposal for linking to the U.N. convention has been considered. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you, U.K. Before we have a response, I know Australia had mentioned or suggested something in our discussion earlier. So, Australia, can you --

AUSTRALIA:

I can. Thank you, Chair. And thank you to the U.K. for raising this issue. This has been discussed recently within the GAC. And I think there's widespread acceptance that this is a very important issue.

From my reading -- and perhaps I will put it out there for comment from the board. From my reading, this is potentially already covered by one of the existing safeguards. What the GAC did in its Beijing Communique is identify a category relating to children. We identified some safeguards that should apply to strings in that category. And the board, I'm happy to note, or the NGPC has offered something, which is, basically, acceptance of that, which is very welcome.

One of those safeguards is registry operators will include in their acceptable use policy, the registrants comply with all applicable laws in relation to privacy data collection, et cetera, which is where many of the clusters of these sensitivities lie. I'm wondering if it would be useful for the GAC to inform the board that we consider that includes the U.N. convention in this case. So, for the avoidance of doubt, to be clear and so on. So there is an explicit reference to the importance of the issue. And, to be clear, the GAC has done this in many instances. We've said applicable laws and given examples of what we mean by this and so on. It would be in the same spirit, not a new safeguard, but to be very clear that we consider that this is something that's covered by our existing safeguard.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you very much. So a couple things. I appreciate the question. And, Australia, thank you. Peter, thank you for your input, which I think is correct. Let me make a point that it's not necessarily limited to the fact that a TLD string, a top-level domain string, refers to children. Those strings themselves may -- top-level domains may be marketed to children, but it's entirely possible that those strings are not named -- you wouldn't put in the category of children would also be aimed at children. So the key is not to have specific protections or things built around those

particular TLDs but, rather, to have an overarching principle. And I think what Peter has outlined is actually the case.

And I won't speak for the NGPC; but I think can say that, if we received advice from the GAC that -- in the terms that Peter has suggested in respect to making this specific point, that that convention or, indeed, anything else for that matter, relevance was covered by the overarching applicable law requirements, that that would be something that we would welcome.

In respect to your other questions, Mark, it's pretty hard for me to answer those on the fly. If the U.K. government would like to write to us and ask us a series of questions, I'm sure we'd be happy to respond. Thank you, heather.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. Ah, Mike, please.

MIKE SILBER: Thank you, Chair. If I can just add on to what Chris has been saying in response, specifically, to the intervention from Australia, or clarification, the more specific advice we get from the GAC, the easier it is for us to act on it or revert and say this is not advice we can act on. We need to discuss -- maybe it's worthwhile even

discussing the specific nature of the advice in a smaller group to get advice that we can act upon.

Generic comments -- as much as is apparent, I'm extremely concerned about child online safety. Generic comments and statements about expressing concern is incredibly difficult without some real outcome. And I don't think the GAC wants us to express concern and to indicate that we've taken it seriously. You want to see real action items coming out of that. And there, I think, an interaction as to what specifically is required. Because online child safety is a complex issue. Are we talking about the protection of the data that sits within Web sites?

Well, again, the ability for us through the registry and the registrars to impose that on domain registrants is quite a complex issue and something that's worth discussing. The ability to deal with questions of content on Web sites, depending on the location from which the registrant is based as well as where the site is hosted is, again, a complex issue.

So the more specificity we can get as to what are the actual problems that are concerning people -- and we can then either respond to specific advice or we can engage on how we build appropriate mechanisms. And then the GAC can advise us around the implementation of some of those. But it really needs to be specific. Because this is such a big issue that it could, potentially,

as Chris indicated, involve every existing gTLD -- new gTLDs that haven't been indicated as well as ccTLDs. And we also need to ensure that there is at least some equivalence across those as well. We certainly can look at increasing protections. But we need to recognize the existing TLDs as well.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you for that, Mike. Does anyone else want to comment on this topic? I think we've heard you loud and clear that the more specific and clear our advice is on something, that the easier it is for the board to consider and act as appropriate. Okay.

So just checking my list.

We had some discussion about category 2 as well. And we don't have a great deal of comments to make on the category 2 advice. However, I think the U.S. had raised a point in our earlier discussion that you may wish to raise now with the NGPC. Okay. And I see the Netherlands as well. Great.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. It was an issue that we shared with colleagues earlier today. And, hopefully, it will resonate with you as well this afternoon.

We have picked up on the modifications that you have made. And, frankly, let me again step back.

The update as to where you stand in dealing with the closed generics or the restricted exclusive access was extremely helpful. And we do understand that this is still a work in progress and that you have not completed that. So point taken.

But, in fact, that sort of motivated us to flag a slight difference between the GAC Beijing advice and what you had put in your latest communication to us that will be going into the registry agreement.

So, if I may say, the GAC advice actually referred quite specifically to ensuring that registry operators do not give undue preference to any registrars or registrants, including itself, and shall not subject registrars or registrants to an undue disadvantage.

And we use that language, I think, quite deliberately. There has been a slight change in that that, I believe, thinking you can tell me, please -- if your thinking was that the limitation of registrations exclusively to a single person or entity or that person's entities or affiliates, whether you thought that was a mirror image. I think we might suggest that undue preference in non-discrimination actually could potentially go beyond that. So we would urge you to rethink about going back to those terms to

make sure that there is no discrimination in the registration policy.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Next we have the Netherlands, please.

NETHERLANDS: Thank you, Heather. And thank you also NGPC for your work so far. I think it's -- I think Australia said it's quite challenging to fit in and to squeeze all the things the GAC wants in -- very late in the process. And I really appreciate, let me say, the efforts made now.

I have a question in line with Suzanne's intervention.

What I understand is that, in the exclusive access part -- registry aspect, I think the majority of the 190 respondents, in a sense that they will be open, which is, basically, I think, a very -- well, let's say, motivating for us, meaning that majority of the generic strings operators will really work in an open fashion, in an open way of -- and also delivering an open space, which I think from the Netherlands' point of view is a very important aspect.

I wonder what -- I think I have two questions. First of all, I think a couple of these applicants or applications still have in their own

application a closed setup of their -- while they responded that they will be open.

Secondly, I think there are still 10 remaining, which is not so much, which is I think a good thing. And you said this is for -- still for further consideration what we want to do with this 10.

So my question is, first of all, how you maybe repair the applications which, in essence, as they were presented and accepted were closed while they are now going to be open. And, secondly, what you anticipate, of course, big question with the remaining ones which generic terms which are not open. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

If I may, in respect to the remaining ones, the situation is we'll be writing either have or will be writing to them to ask them to explain to us why they think they would be able to comply with the GAC's advice. And, once we have those explanations from them, then we will be coming back to the GAC for a discussion about that.

In respect to the ones who have indicated that they are going to not be exclusive access, they will each have to submit a change request to their application. There is a process for doing that. And, because they have changed the tenor of the application,

they'll be required to submit a change request. So they've been told they must submit a change request.

CHAIR DRYDEN: One of the related questions -- ah, Olga. Did you want to comment on that? Please, go ahead.

OLGA MADRUGA-FORTI: I just wanted to add, very briefly, that, among the information that we'll be asking for this remaining small population is really precisely how having a business plan based on a closed model will enhance and serve the public interest. So we're going to circle it right into looking at how conceivably could operating on a closed basis be in such furtherance of the public interest. And that should help illuminate this small remaining population.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you for that, Olga. So one of the questions that came up for us were around how you identified which applicants to approach to elicit a response about the proposed public interest commitments specification that refers to operating in an open and transparent way. So is that something that you could clarify for us? Did you write to everyone that was applying for a generic

term defined in a certain way? Or did you just refer to the list that the GAC had?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No. We asked everyone, every single applicant for every single domain name to tell us.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Okay. All right. So thank you. Clear answer there. All right.

Are there any other comments on category 2? Okay.

Well, that's great. All right. So unless there are other pressing issues to raise with the NGPC -- ah, U.K., please.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. It's not an issue as such, although it does relate to ensuring effective implementation of safeguards. There's a model being circulated for ensuring that in respect to regulated industry gTLDs. It's a policy advisory board model. It hasn't been discussed by the GAC. And I'm not saying that this is a representation to you on behalf of the GAC. But I -- amongst the European group, there has been expressions of interest in this as a proposal that has a lot of merit. It envisages a policy advisory board being set up for these particular registries relating to regulated industries which would comprise experts and consumer

interests, representatives, other constituent groups, enforcement, other representatives and, indeed, government and administrative representation, too. Perhaps you know this proposal. It's been widely circulated, I believe.

I would recommend that it be put out to consultation so that comments were invited on this proposal. As I say, some GAC members see merit in it. It could be the basis for an effective mechanism for the registries to ensure that their operational functions are carried out in full consistency with the safeguards which we are discussing in dialogue with yourselves.

So that's my suggestion, that this model be put out to consultation and comments invited. And I'm sure governments like the U.K. will be interested in responding to that and informing your proposals for ensuring effective implementation of safeguards. Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Thank you, Mark. We are aware of the proposal. And we are still considering it. I don't think there's much more to say about that. It's still in the works and still considering it.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Okay. Switzerland?

SWITZERLAND: Just very quickly to support the U.K. in advising you to seriously consider this as a useful option. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, Switzerland. U.K., a follow-up.

UNITED KINGDOM: Just with regard to my specific question. Is your considering of this taking into account the option to go out to full consultation on that? Or are you not yet ready to answer that? I'm sorry. I didn't quite understand.

CHERINE CHALABY: Not quite ready to answer that question. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Okay. Are there any other requests to speak? United States.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for indulging me for going beyond category 1 and category 2. Just wanted to take this short opportunity to flag and give you a heads up. We will be communicating these questions to you in writing in our analysis of the implementation proposals for the overarching safeguards, the six safeguards applicable to all new gTLDs. We have flagged a

couple of implementation questions. I won't take everybody's time here, but I did want to go on the record to let you know we will be coming forward. And these are, again, implementation questions for clarification. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Okay. So at this point I think we might be able to move towards closing. I understand you wanted to raise an issue, Chris. Okay. So please do so.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

So I have a question for you. And -- which I'm not expecting necessarily anyone to answer today or to comment on. And I'm speaking personally.

I understand that there's at least one application, possibly more, where -- sorry, Suzanne.

I understand that there is at least one application, and possibly more, where a government or part of a government is negotiating with an applicant in respect to receiving a financial benefit from the applicant, and I'm concerned about that and I wonder if the GAC had a view about whether such matters were, in fact, appropriate.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you for the question.

Italy, please.

ITALY: A procedural question.

I see that the signing the contracts is accelerated quite sensibly in the last weeks. And then also, there is a feeling of the registries that are in line to be approved, let's say, for the contract. And so I see that the there is a momentum now.

And I would like to know your role as a commission of the Board. Do you give the go-ahead after looking at the problems, if any problems, were caused by GAC advice or objections or things like that?

And my question is sometimes and in which cases you find that may be an opinion of the GAC should be mentioned before than giving a go-ahead. But what I see is actually there is a movement, a real increase of new contracts signed per week. And this is interesting, of course, and we would like to know a little bit about the role you play there. Thank you.

AKRAM ATALLAH: Hello? Yes, thank you. Before any contract is signed we provide the NGPC a list of all of the contracts that are about to be signed.

And we -- with the list, there are all of the tests that have been checked, whether there is GAC advice remaining or -- actually, the list shows that there is no GAC advice remaining, that there is no contention set, that there is no remaining issues that have to be resolved before the contract is signed. And then after -- before they go to delegation, provide the same list again notifying the Board of the event and that this is all of the -- if there was any issues, it has been resolved, if any.

So there is a supervisory role of the Board on making sure that we followed the process and through the entire delegation process.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Okay. Thank you for that answer, Akram.

Okay. So if we can -- China, you had a question? Please.

CHINA:

Yes, I have a question to NGPC. Maybe it's about the -- to identify the strings.

I would speak Chinese, maybe.

I want to thank NGPC to accept GAC's suggestion, particularly regarding Guangzhou and Shenzhen strings. As far as we know, the gTLD application for Guangzhou and Shenzhen has entered extended evaluation process based on our understanding. Right

now, it's lacking the endorsement from the government. So from my personal understanding, once we enter extended evaluation process, I would say it has entered the no-more-review process, without the government's endorsement, the application will not receive the delegation, will not be authorized.

So I just want to verify with NGPC, does GAC have to further give their suggestion for this?

CHAIR DRYDEN: Okay.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you for the question. We will respond off-line on that. Okay?

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Okay. All right. So we have a few questions for clarification where we can follow-up; maybe a few things where the GAC may wish to provide some further advice to elaborate on the proposals and to elaborate on previous advice that we have given. But I do think it's important to underscore that, generally speaking, the kinds of points we're raising today are really focused on implementation of the advice we have given you and in response

to the proposals that you have put together. And that is the result of a great deal of effort on the part of the NGPC and staff as well. And that we need to find ways to keep moving things forward quickly and allow all of those strings and applications captured in the category 1 and category 2 advice to move ahead unless there are other reasons to not.

So I see a request from Belgium.

Please, go ahead.

BELGIUM:

Sorry to take the floor, but I would like to join the question of the Chinese delegate for -- Would be very interesting -- interested for the answer.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Yes, I believe the NGPC intends to respond to that question. So noted. Thank you.

All right.

Okay. So let's thank, at this point, our colleagues from the NGPC.

And, Cherine, did you have a few words to say before we conclude?

CHERINE CHALABY:

Yes.

First of all, we will respond to all the questions that we didn't respond today.

I wanted to return the compliment and thanks to the GAC. I think you guys have spent enormous amount of hours giving us advice. And it was very well received. And we work together I think for the benefit of the community and it was very a very good relationship, I feel, we're at this point in time.

And I sense that from the questions today, they are questions more about implementation, and you want reassurance that your advice is going to be implemented in the right way. And I think we're coming towards the end. I think the community needs to know that there is a point where we are getting closure on category 1 and category 2. And my sense is we're very close and we can get things moving along.

So thank you. Thank you very much for all the effort and for the advice you've given us.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you very much.

Switzerland, did you have one final quick remark?

SWITZERLAND: Yes, thank you.

Actually, I just have a quick question. And first of all, I wanted to thank the members of the NGPC that were present on the meeting that we had the chairs and vice chairs of the GAC, with some representatives of the intergovernmental organizations, yesterday morning. And I think good progress was made to come to an acceptable solution for everybody. Unfortunately, the meeting today that was supposed to continue with this has been canceled, so my question to you would be will there be information before Wednesday on how this work is going to continue? Because that would be important for us to know, to have some confidence on that these processes are going on on what has been discussed.

Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: The short answer is probably no by Wednesday. My understanding of where we left it yesterday is we would take the input and we would make some adjustments to the document that is currently before you, and we would get that back to you as soon as we can. But the chances of us being able to do that by Wednesday are almost zero.

So we will do so as soon as we can.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. Okay.

All right. I see one more request to speak. Iran, do you insist?

IRAN: Chairman, it's not interesting and I'm not going to raise any question, but I would like to express our feeling. The work of the NGPC is very critical, very delicate, and very important. Without singling out a particular case of other groups, we would wish to express our sincere appreciation for the time, devotion and efforts that they put on this important issues, and for the very concise and precise and cautionary reply they have given today to all of the questions. That is a good example that the issue is very critical, very important, and very delicate. That happens why in some cases they said that they need more time to reply the question; in some cases, they said they would reply off-line answers of some of them.

So it shows that the issue is very well treated, and would like to express our sincere appreciation to the entire committee dealing with this matter.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: And with that -- Yes, a round of applause. Sure.

Okay. Have a good evening, everyone. And for the GAC, 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, please.

Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]