
SINGAPORE - Francophonie @ ICANN
Monday February 9, 2015 - 17:00 to 18:30 hours
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

EMMANUEL: Your silence prompts me to go on. I will therefore start with the first item.

The first item concerns the guidance document. What is the purpose of this guidance document? We have started the work at the level of the French-speaking consultation. And we have been following the discussions at the level of ICANN for some years now. It seemed necessary to work beyond what we do, beyond the objectives and the agendas of ICANN.

Because, ultimately, the work that we do is not to simply participate in international meetings. But to ensure that, in our countries, Internet be a vector of economic growth. That Internet be also a vector that fosters democracy and innovation, ensuring that our communities of French-speaking citizens be able to fully benefit from this infrastructure.

From that moment on, we have also noted that, in terms of content, our input to the major discussions so as to limit some impacts on the public policies in our countries, has also enabled us to further our vision of things, our culture. Because we are also part of an important geocultural space, i.e. the Francophonie. It is important to further this in the context of ICANN and beyond ICANN, in all Internet governance forums.

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.

For this to happen, it is important to review the way we work in order to be able to act in an efficient manner. It is in this context that we have considered that, beyond the global participation, we should work on building and strengthening the Internet ecosystems in our countries and in our regions so as to be more efficient than in the past. This explains the guidance document.

For the moment and after the analysis of the document, we would like to know if there are any comments? Are there any remarks? Are there suggestions so as to improve and extend this guidance document that could guide us in our actions?

The list is open. I remind you that there is also the remote participation. Our friends have already the link of the ICANN website. I just sent it through the mailing list. Our friends who did not have the opportunity to travel to Singapore will be able to benefit from the remote participation.

As there is a six to eight-hour time difference, those waking up on the other side will hopefully have the opportunity to take their coffee with us, remotely.

The list is open and we will move quickly.

Do we have to consider that the document has not been read? Yes. In your case, I understood well. For the majority, not to say 99%, it seems it has been well received. Unless there are technical problems [inaudible] considering your extended competences.

Fatimata.



FATIMATA SEYE SILLA: Thank you Emmanuel.

I would like to make a comment and say that I think it is a document that has been thoroughly considered with regard to all issues with recommendations that are quite strong. We have shared it, more or less. Today may be the time to make amendments, if there are any.

All I could add as a strong recommendation is actually the implementation strategy of those recommendations. Which are the effective means and ways we can have so that these recommendations are well implemented.

We do a lot of recommendations, generally speaking. Thinking is not lacking. Strategy ideas are not lacking. It is the implementation of those strategies that is lacking and often delays us with regard to the objectives we aim at.

That is what I wanted to say.

I would like to add at the same time that we have added an item on the agenda relating to one of the recommended strategies that aims at favoring and promoting the presence of French-speaking officials in the steering and direction bodies of such authorities. Either at the level of the IGF, at the level of ICANN, at the level of all Internet Governance structures, everything possible must be done so as to be there since the handful of people present at the level of such authorities are practically always the same. Renewal is good. It is good to think of a new wave of young French-speaking people who should take over.



Thank you.

MODERATOR: Koffi. Please introduce yourself.

KOFFI FABRICE DJOSSOU: Thank you Mr. moderator. Koffi Fabrice, I work for the ZACR, the South-African central registry in charge of operating .Africa.

I would like not only to support what Mrs Fatimata said but also to point out that what is important is the effective participation. To be able to have an impact and be part of a working group within ICANN, or through ICANN constituencies, participation must be thoroughly effective.

This brings me to the second item. One says, well, well, there is the Francophonie; the crucible of French-speaking countries. In the case of Africa, there are more French-speaking than English-speaking countries but the place of the French language on the net is quite limited, I would say even marginalized.

What does it mean? It means that we have great concerns with regard to the development of the French language content. How to achieve it as we know that, to some extent, content allows generating growth. To motivate our participants, to have more participants in such meetings, we have to effectively engage our private sector; the real French-speaking private sector, the French-speaking businesses that could be thoroughly active in the dynamics, in the interaction. We should finance initiatives in line with their policies or the strategies of their businesses.



To my opinion, in order to achieve that, as some say "money is the sinews of war", we need to find the means to finance our own initiatives so that our civil society is no more disparate, seeking fellowships or oriented towards other stakes not in line with our interests as a French-speaking community.

My last point has to do with the management of our critical resources, the ccTLD of Africa countries that feature a very dark picture. Allow me to be very direct. When I compare with countries like Kenya, South Africa, French-speaking countries in sub-Saharan Africa have a limited situation not because of their technical problems but at the level of marketing, at the level of the promotion of their national identity. How are we going to have real French-speaking [inaudible] of the DNS, in an inclusive strategy? How to achieve developing our contents and having Internet become a platform of growth for the French-speaking digital entrepreneurship?

Thank you.

EMMANUEL:

Koffi. I think that everybody knows you now and that you can apply in South Africa.

Other remarks? Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL:

Thank you Emmanuel.

Just to come back to the point made by Fatimata about the presence of French-speaking persons in the bodies, I would like to point out that the



NomCom, presided by Stéphane Van Gelder, is seeking nominations both for the Board and for several working groups. I think that if you are interested or if you know people who would be interested, this is a good time to speak to Stéphane to see what is available and what could be done.

LOUIS HOULE: There is Fatimata and myself, Louis Houle from ISOC Quebec. We are both on the NomCom. It would be also useful if you could take one of the small cards on the table.

PARTICIPANT: There is also Alain.

LOUIS HOULE: Yes. There is also Alain, the person from Orange. [Inaudible]

PARTICIPANT: And also for the elections.

LOUIS HOULE: It will be for another time.

PARTICIPANT: I would like to briefly respond to the various remarks.

Indeed, the idea is to make sure that we change the way to do things. I can already tell you that at the level of the IOF, all the work done over



the past years through the strategy of digital Francophonie and the economic strategy of the Francophonie moves in the direction of these proposals. This is the first item.

The second item is that it is now important that we mobilize the large French-speaking businesses that are involved in the digital sector and even the businesses that are not directly digital but could be affected by the digital. It is important that we have a strategy to mobilize them so that these businesses take part in the issue of undertaking what is for example in connection to their interests, as these businesses are not philanthropic ones. We have to be aware of it. Beyond their commercial strategy, these businesses are sometimes keen to become citizen businesses and are sometimes concerned with their social responsibility.

These are elements that we could put forward. We could see the stakeholders of these businesses who are with us and see how they could help us further mobilize the businesses in the framework of our internal strategy. Because you have well noted that in the English-speaking world, without referring to a specific country, such businesses are heavily involved. Such businesses are even involved beyond the limits of those countries and go to our spaces to proceed to civil society acquisitions to their benefit. We all know that.

Why let the others act in our space, if I dare say, and let them go on with civil society acquisitions. Why don't we mobilize ourselves our civil society, our private sector, our researchers. Because when you look at the ICANN, even at the IETF and other structures, one mobilizes a lot of researchers, a lot of lawyers, of specialists on these issues, of academics



who come and debate, in relation to their function of course, about their way of thinking, their jurisdiction, their legal system. As for us, there are very few French-speaking researchers who get involved and take part in other meetings, who try to contribute our vision of the world. Because the point is also to contribute one's vision of the world to what is happening.

Therefore, we need to work on getting out of our Internet community cocoons, which is a somewhat reduced community as concerns the French-speaking aspects. We need to expand and popularize our presence throughout our countries. That is why we need to work a lot on the necessity of strengthening and optimizing the national and regional ecosystems.

This is what I wanted to say in this respect.

To go further, wouldn't it be more interesting to put for example in a working group two or three persons who would think about this issue of mobilization of businesses and come up with proposals on such basis so that we may proceed?

It is a proposal. I do not know what you think of it. Don't be shy. You are not shy usually. To mobilize the businesses, to mobilize our researchers, to mobilize the civil society. If the working group starts working, we could give them one month to come up with thoughts that would enable us to proceed.

I think there is a volunteer.



PAUL: It is for a question, please. Paul [inaudible] from the company Socatel [inaudible] from the Central African Republic.

I am somewhat surprised at the approach. It is the first time I take part in this meeting. Well. We look for the means, but what are we to do with what I heard so far? I do not know how and at which level we plan to influence the world of the Internet or the decisions. And we will establish right away a team in charge of seeking the means to move.

We should first be able to hear about the mechanisms of ICANN with regard to the transition of IANA [inaudible] explained to us today how they are trying for some time now to open the Internet system control circle and how the French-speaking world will integrate this world to contribute as well.

I think that this would be the first question to ask ourselves before seeking the means. The means, we can always find means. [Inaudible]

MODERATOR: In this regard, I have to say very briefly that the actors who are here know exactly what should be done. Besides, this has been said because the bodies have already been identified. And there is a certain number of issues we often face, the travels of the actors so that they can take part in the meetings. We also face issues with regard to the engagement of researchers to work on some questions.

These issues are well addressed, if I may use a Francophone language.

From that point of view, I am not worried. That is why I would like, first, to welcome you and to wish that you familiarize yourself with these



issues so as to move the matter forward also at the level of Central Africa.

Chantal.

CHANTAL LEBRUMENT:

Yes. Chantal Lebrument; I am here in my capacity as president of Eurolinc, an association that works on multilingualism, and as president of the company Open-Root developed by Louis Pouzin.

Indeed, means are a big problem. But the gentleman from Central Africa, I did not retain his name, is quite right to the extent that we know, facing the English-speaking world, it is not the businesses themselves that pay, even if it goes somewhere through their companies. It is the government that has billions and billions put in the Internet.

So it is not the small businesses of the French-speaking world, that undergo a total crisis in Europe, that are going to disburse funds to send French-speaking delegates to international meetings. If there are so many researchers who attend the ICANN meetings, it is simply because their expenses are fully paid for. In general, it is paid very well. This also explains it.

In fact, it is an issue we face in a recurrent manner. People have to go to international meetings. They have to take part in the discussions. They have to speak French. They have to express themselves and bring back information, write reports for the community. But the means, we will not have them in the six months to come. It is not going to take place this way. There is a political level to implement so that they become



aware that speaking French is not anecdotal. It is a whole community. It is something cultural; there is a culture behind it and a way of thinking that is different.

PARTICIPANT:

Thank you Emmanuel. First, I would like to remind our friend from Central Africa who participates for the first time in the consultation meeting that has a framework defined some time ago, almost a year, that when the American government announced its intention, namely that the community finds a platform for the management of the IANA functions, the French-speaking consultation made two inputs with regard, first, to the initiative and second during the NETmundial meeting in Brazil. We made an input to present firstly the position of the French-speaking community consultation and secondly, a certain number of points which seemed important to us in order to develop such digital culture and so that the Internet be a tool not only at the service of cultural diversity but also at the service of the community, of research, of education and of the economic world.

If I am not mistaken, today's meeting is a follow-up and we have to see how we can recalibrate the work done for more than one year now.

EMMANUEL:

So I come back to my proposal. Maybe at the level of the proposal, it could be better elaborated so that the charter of this commission be a charter that could identify not only what should be done but also what has already been done and then which strategy to set up in order to engage not only the businesses but also the governments, as already



said. Because there is an element mentioned by Chantal concerning the political level; How to ensure that political actors get also involved in this.

Fatimata.

FATIMATA SEYE SILLA: Thank you Emmanuel. Thank you Chantal also for having mentioned the governments and their input.

I think that it is especially the governments, the states, who have the means and support their citizens. But when we think about the developing countries, it is a totally different dimension. It is in general the private sector or the agencies that are sometimes neither private nor public that send delegates to this kind of meetings.

I think the idea of Emmanuel is somewhat innovative. It is normal to see it this way, because it is not easy to set up an innovative idea. I will give you very quickly an example at the level of Senegal.

EMMANUEL: Fatimata, would you be interested by being part of the group to be able [inaudible] this input. Because I have to worry about the time unless ICANN says we can use 30 more minutes.

FATIMATA SEYE SILLA: I am ready to give this example on line if the group is established. But I am not volunteering as I do not like to commit myself if I cannot do the work the way I want it. Thank you.



EMMANUEL: Is the idea accepted? What do you think? Or to speed up, who is against the idea? A show of hands to speed up.

LOUIS HOULE: Just one thing to be clarified. I am not sure I have understood well. The idea, it is the establishment of the group? Is that right?

EMMANUEL: Yes.

LOUIS HOULE: Could we eventually clarify a little the charter or the wording of this charter?

EMMANUEL: There is a remote participation from Mamadou, Senegal.

With a view to opening the French-speaking community of ICANN, how to make the information mainly related to the Internet Governance more accessible to the French-speaking community? What should be the communication strategy so that it is more inclusive?

Two questions from Mamadou [Lo].

Already at the level of the charter, I clarify again. The charter is a charter of levels or key points.



1. To identify the work to be done, what to do with the money concretely should we have it available. To speak a clearer language, which are the actions to undertake. From this point of view, we can also draw from the guidance document that shows there are some actions to deploy.
2. Which is the strategy to set up in order to engage the civil society, the private sector, the large businesses in particular and especially the government and the private sector, to engage the means.

FATIMATA SEYE SILLA:

It becomes complicated now. That is not what I had understood. I had understood that we needed to establish a think tank on a strategy of engagement of the private sector to enable the participation of a maximum of French-speaking persons in the various decision making bodies. That is what I had understood.

EMMANUEL:

That was the basic idea. It is in the light of the discussion that I was trying to broaden the charter.

The basic idea was indeed to see how to engage a maximum of French-speaking persons; not only to participate here but also to contribute to the building of ecosystems at the regional and national levels. That was the basic idea. This is what you just set out.

In the light of the remarks, I was trying to integrate the remarks in this basic idea. It is not clear?



FATIMATA SEYE SILLA: I think it is clear. But it could make the work so broad that it would come back to the guidance document.

EMMANUEL: I'll be quick. I suggest, if you agree, also in terms of time management, that the working group starts on the basic idea. That is to say, we do the work on the basic idea and we see afterwards if other aspects should be added. Do you agree?

PARTICIPANT: Thank you. I think that the guidance document will mention a certain number of important matters. To my opinion, the whole of this content should be expanded. Afterwards, we could consult several groups to focus on very specific topics. Because the field is quite broad and in the French-speaking community we want to be able to contribute effectively to something already working well and structured, we need [inaudible] consequence.

It would only be one single aspect of the problem.

EMMANUEL: I think that your proposal is very interesting but it would be good to move quickly on what is urgent right now. What is urgent is how to make French-speaking actors participate more.

To participate more, we have understood that the arrangements adopted up until now do not facilitate the task and that the way to do should be reviewed, so as to engage the governments and especially the private businesses depending on the context. Because issues differ from



one country to another, from one region to another in the French-speaking space. Issues are not the same everywhere. We need to take this in consideration.

I would like to come back to my basic proposal. Could we start from this basic proposal?

HAWA DIAKITE:

I am Hawa Diakite from Mali, for those who do not know me.

I would say that the basic proposal is quite good but I would have preferred that we maintain the overall form; I mean the overall strategy to improve and mobilize the participation while detailing it in three sub-points.

Namely:

1. Which strategy is needed for the private sector?
2. Which strategy is needed for the governments?
3. Which strategy is needed for the civil society?

Because we might try hard to engage the private sector but if there is no political sector to accompany it, the result will be zero. We need that the political sector gets the information and be really pervaded by the subject so as to assist the private sector. If the private sector is alone without the political one, the result will fall short of our expectations.



EMMANUEL: We have already used 40 minutes. I would like Ali to speak for 30 seconds.

ALI HADJI: I am Ali Hadji from the Comoros.

In fact, I opened my mouth and Emmanuel spoke. I just wanted to remind you that we have one hour. So if each one tried to make a proposal, we might not be able to make it time wise.

Either we agree on the setting up of the group and start from the basic idea. Or, if not, I would suggest that we move forward. Because I have the feeling that we are not progressing. I am taking notes and I can see that we are not moving forward.

EMMANUEL: Mr. [Ridwan]

[RIDWAN]: Thank you. I speak on behalf of Morocco.

The idea of creating a think tank seems to me very positive in the sense that the sought objective is that interventions will lead to the attendance and especially to the active participation. I underline that. Because participating for the sake of participating is useless.

We are in a process already launched within ICANN. And I think that the Francophonie as a group and a cultural diversity, as a common destiny, has a position to take. To do so, I would say that this think tank, the terms of reference of which have of course to be defined, should also be

tasked with finding ways of strengthening the active participation of the Francophonie in the current discussions, either with regard to the transition or to the future of global governance.

I therefore insist on this important aspect beyond the material and financial one.

EMMANUEL:

With regard to the second proposal, at the level of forthcoming discussions, we are going to discuss it under the second item. Because there is still another proposal at this level.

Do we agree on the group? I see there is no major opposition. So from this moment on, I would like to have three volunteers. There is Hawa, [inaudible] and there is Koffi.

Is there a proposal here? OK. Then, we write down these three.

I have Mr. [CDK], I do not have the name, who supports the creation of the working group and would like to be part of it. But [inaudible]; Ah, it is [inaudible]. Because I do not always have the abbreviations.

Ah. He said "write down [Cyriac Okuma]" from Gabon. He is the general secretary of the Ministry of Digital Economy of Gabon. He wants to be a member of the working group.

Could we please move forward and tackle the second item. The second item concerns the IANA functions stewardship transition, the reform of the responsibility and of ICANN on the whole, let us say things this way.



To introduce this new item, I would like to present our friend from France, Damien Coudeville, from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and invite him to review the situation in a compact and comprehensive manner so that we can also put forward proposals to strengthen the participation of the French-speaking space in this discussion.

DAMIEN COUDEVILLE:

Thank you Emmanuel. So I am going to speak in English !

[French] I will come back to this specific point because I owe you both an apology and explanations, and I then would like to thank you for the messages forwarded. It is the first GAC meeting I attend where French is so much spoken, as well as other languages too. So, a salutary message.

To simply explain that I expressed myself in English on this topic because it is an extremely technical topic about which we have already struggled in European coordination groups; It was not easy to forward the ideas in English.

Despite what has been said, sometimes translation might be poor. Regarding some topics, we have to adopt strong positions or we are forced to revisit such positions.

Nevertheless, in the light of the reactions this has generated, we are going to try to find a somewhat different way to work in the future. Including, possibly, if we have a statement, to suggest a translation directly to the interpreters. On the other hand, I clarify that the situation may occur again and I will warn you beforehand. In particular, I think about the session concerning the negotiation of the communiqué



that will take place live and necessarily in English. It will naturally be more difficult to speak in French.

So I'm very happy. Thank you very much.

On the IANA transition, I think you are following all the debates so I'll be quite brief. You know that simply with regard to the IANA transition component, four groups have been set up in total.

A group of coordination of these three groups that have to come out with a proposal on each of the three big components of the IANA functions, addresses, numbers, under the purview of the RIR, the Regional Internet Registries, the registries of the five big regions. An aspect concerning the protocol parameters, more within the purview of the IETF, so there we are almost no longer at the ICANN. The last component is the most political and difficult component, the naming one, the one occupying us primarily.

The first two groups have already transmitted their proposal.

The pending proposal is the one related to the naming function and is today the subject of many debates since it resulted in four big models, two external models, which means roughly a structure external to ICANN that would guarantee a basic principle. Should things go wrong, the external entity could select a new operator for the IANA functions. The strategic component of the Internet directory. It would be delegated to a corporation that would be in one case either a jurisdiction external to the USA, or an American jurisdiction, a big difference eventually. And two internal options consisting in any case in giving the community the power to remove the IANA functions from



ICANN. One option would be to incorporate a "Golden Bylaw" in ICANN Bylaws. The other would set up a "Guardian", the details of this option have not been defined yet. A guardian is not necessarily a single person of course.

So these are the two big options. They have been criticized in two ways that are [inaudible]; this is the problem. First of all, concerning the external to ICANN options. Roughly, it is complicated and how could that be achieved within the time limits because it implies quite a number of legal issues. You can imagine. Which type of contract needs to be entered into between the external structure and ICANN. On the other hand, the big problem is that it depends a lot on the second process on ICANN Accountability. Which means, yes, why not give it all to ICANN provided that somehow some control be kept. Here also, obviously, it will take time. In both cases, we are heading for periods that will probably exceed the date of September 30, 2015.

Hence the idea of Larry Strickling, the NTIA administrator, to reassure the community saying that exceeding the date of September 30, 2015 does not mean that we cannot work a bit longer. This "longer" being of course conditional upon the American elections context, the position of Larry Strickling himself may change upon a presidential change.

So this was the first group. The second group on Accountability has made much less headway. *Reddition de comptes* or *redevabilité* in French. Or in bad French. It is very American. But let us not linger on terminology. The second group is lagging behind with regard to the first point. Besides, the two processes are very different. The proposal of the ICG, the IANA Stewardship Coordination Group - coordination on the



names, addresses and protocol parameters - that will be established by the whole of stakeholders will be directly given to the NTIA. So it is the NTIA that will validate that work.

In the other case, the one on Accountability, we will have the ICANN Board, the ICANN Director who will maintain control. This leads to a situation where the problem is that within the group on Accountability, the whole issue and the principle that they are trying to establish is a principle of community control of the ICANN decisions that are only taken by the Board today.

We have a process where the aim is to control the Board and at the same time, the Board must lead the process. It is indeed very difficult. But it is still the basic principle put on the table today by the whole of stakeholders. Precisely, an oversight of ICANN decisions and therefore of the Board. Hence the idea doing the rounds. We hear about a general assembly or things like that. This brings already some solutions.

But the idea is already to validate a principle which is precisely that of the oversight. In the same way that in the first group we are going to validate the principle of removing the IANA functions from ICANN, in the second group, we try to validate, sorry, I want to say the stakeholders try to validate the principle of an oversight of the Board decisions by a higher body; not all the Board decisions. The point is to define in which case a decision of the Board can be reversed.

So this is the situation today. We are talking about facts. All that I am describing.



We are not all governmental bodies, but to recount the debates within the GAC on these issues, in particular what had to do with the IANA functions. The debates took place during the ICANN session in Los Angeles. The GAC, finally, launched itself in an exercise in which it described the main principles that should be considered by the group on the names. Obviously, this work was painstaking and went far beyond the ICANN meeting. Which resulted in the GAC itself not being able to endorse those principles.

Nevertheless, the effort that has been led made it possible for all governments to feed that process, by saying to the people in charge "take this in consideration. It is not necessarily the position of the GAC, but we consider that for some governments, it is important".

Today, a few months later, we are more or less at the same point with regard to the Accountability group. Obviously, the debates are more heated because the issues are more complex. Especially, at the present time, it goes around the solutions. We talk a lot about a general assembly. In some way, we are getting ahead of ourselves.

Yet, the group in charge of making the proposal is now at a point where they are trying to notch these principles. These main principles. Even at their level. To avoid the debates on the solutions right now because each one has its own solution, in general. Let us put the principles on the table and try to engage in this exercise.

It was also the meaning of what we said, I am describing the position of my country, during the GAC session and related calls were made to the GAC even if some governments launched themselves right away on the solutions. It was precisely to validate these principles. Today, the GAC



wants to launch the same exercise, maybe to perceive that, eventually, like in the first group, many of the principles preoccupying the governments, preoccupy the stakeholders too. They have already been put on the table by the stakeholders.

This is where we are today. But I am simply talking on behalf of my country and I urge you all as French-speaking parties not to let yourselves, I will not say be trapped; It is tempting to embark on debates on the solutions but you should already try to imagine which are the principles that are important for you to assert, without putting solutions on the table. You can imagine [inaudible]. It is just impossible. There are too many people taking part in the definition of these solutions. But simply in a way allowing us at the end to verify that what is put on the table will go in the sense of the principles you set out, or will observe those principles, will go towards those objectives, if objectives have been set. Right now, it is simply a way to support the work of the stakeholders who, once again, for us, we speak a lot about the American context, are doing a remarkable job to our opinion, to the extent that they have put the true problems on the table in the framework of the two processes given to them.

Thank you.

EMMANUEL:

Thank you Damien for these explanations. In the light of these explanations, the major concern is to know which are the proposals of the French-speaking community.



I think someone started addressing this issue to say how we can effectively contribute to this. It is my understanding that in the existing timetables that must be updated, there will be a public comment window, starting the month of April.

From that moment on, couldn't we, at the level of the French-speaking community, put in place a strategy similar to what has been proposed in the first part of our discussion, consisting of establishing a small group that will try to coordinate the thoughts of the Francophonie on this matter? To be able to participate actively and to give our opinion with regard to these two debates taking place at the present time.

What do you think? I do not see any reaction. Sorry?

PARTICIPANT: I said, very good idea.

EMMANUEL: You are speaking on behalf of everybody? I understood you were made the spokesperson.

Well, let's go. Maybe Mr. Louis Houle from ISOC Canada would like to contribute to this?

LOUIS HOULE: I have no reply. But [inaudible]. Thank you, it was very well explained.

I see different mechanisms that would allow us to formulate a French-speaking answer to this. Among these mechanisms, there are already the bodies and tools available such as, for example, the [inaudible] of



the Internet Society, among others, my [inaudible] the Internet Society of Quebec.

Now there are other mechanisms, other 'mouthpieces'. I do not want to go ahead with this organization. But I am at the Internet Society. Of course, there are collaborations that should probably be initiated on this subject, such as for example with the IETF, what ISOC Quebec has done in the framework of the 2014 Report on the digital [inaudible] in the Francophonie.

But on this specific question, I certainly do not want to answer on behalf of groups that could be the mouthpieces of the Francophonie and would assert the point of view of the Francophonie.

I think that the answer to the raised question has multiple aspects, multiple stakeholders. We understand the complexity of the current situation. [Inaudible] with respect to the governance that is redefining itself, I think that we have a role of reflection and I cannot judge the state of our reflection at the present time. But it would be a good thing that the people who are knowledgeable, like you, inform our group. And through our group, our communities, our speakers, our actors, of the issue relating to the reply elements on the table; to stimulate the start and feed our discussion so that we can formulate valid and relevant replies.

EMMANUEL:

I share whatever can enrich our discussion. I also note that the mechanisms are not very active currently, in the discussion in any case. The mechanisms you are referring to cannot really be seen.



With regard to your proposal, could we already, here, ask those specialized on the topic to give us a summary analysis of all those discussions?

Second element now, to establish a small group at our level and ask this group for an input to the consideration since the consideration spans multiple aspects. This small group can play a role of driving force and guidance for the consideration [inaudible]. Wouldn't this be the good formula instead of waiting for the existing mechanisms to react?

This is what [inaudible].

I think that Jean-Jacques would like to speak.

JEAN-JACQUES:

Not necessarily on this last question. I was simply thinking, couldn't we organize ourselves let's say, upstream. It could be something like a Webinar where the community could ask the French-speaking stakeholders, those who work both on the transition and on the Accountability, when they will be in position to present what is on the table, maybe by March or April. In this way, before the small group starts working, we have got a bridge. We know a little bit what they are talking about. It could be a good way to do it if the Webinar is a good tool for this community.

EMMANUEL:

I support the idea and I think that Jean-Jacques can help us implement it.

I would like us to accept this idea and applaud it.



AZIZ HILALI:

Good morning. I am Aziz from Morocco, president of African At-Large. I would like to thank Damien for this excellent briefing.

In fact, in his talk after Jean-Jacques, he perfectly summarized the situation. Especially given that the documents and the topics being discussed are very important topics, current interest topics. When this is explained like that and what's more, in French, it is very good. This is how French-speaking meetings should be. Because these French-speaking meetings mainly concern people of ICANN, we should often discuss issues relevant to ICANN. I think it is important. Why? Because there are not many of us, even fewer here in Singapore which is a very fine city but has been changed after Marrakesh.

I would like, between brackets, the French-speaking persons and our African friends - in any case, I'm trying my best - to put somewhat the pressure on the ICANN bodies not to change their mind next time and to find excuses such as Ebola. Ebola never existed in Morocco as you know. I.

Well, I support the Webinar idea. Unfortunately, we use it at AFRALO and it is a very interesting and very important tool for the people who cannot travel and attend the ICANN meetings. Unfortunately, I'm talking about our African region, we do not have a massive participation. We are often the same people at the meetings, the people who know the topics. So we have to do this. It is a very good idea, Jean-Jacques. But it has to be done with a lot of communication, explaining to the people that this discussion is very important.



I will end by asking Damien, since he made a very pedagogical presentation on the matter, if he could prepare a document [inaudible] and transmit it to the French-speaking people. It is very interesting to know all this. Because we insist. Someone mentioned the translation earlier. We have the translation and often, we do not entirely understand the topic like the people who understand it and work in the working groups.

I will end by advertising AFRALO a little. On Wednesday, I am inviting everybody, all the French-speaking persons to attend the meeting we are going to have in this room from 14:00 to 15:30 pm. It will be on the responsibility as seen by the African community.

Thank you.

EMMANUEL:

Thank you Aziz.

I think there are two proposals on the table. Webinar, heartily applauded.

Now we have to think about the arrangements in a concrete way; how to be able to mobilize more people so that the French-speaking community be widely informed.

AZIZ HILALI:

One sentence, if I may. ICANN could pay this Webinar, it can do it.

EMMANUEL:

OK. It substantiates even more what has been just said.



The second idea is that we will rely on Damien to prepare a summary note so that we inform the French-speaking community. All this will contribute to the information, as called for by Louis.

DAMIEN COUDEVILLE: I agree on the principle. But, unfortunately, I am a representative of the governments. So I have to ask my authorities first. My briefing might be, even unintentionally, politically changed. So I will have to go through validation. It will probably take two or three weeks, as you all know I imagine. I will start this as soon as I am back home, so I will try to make -

EMMANUEL: If we have agreed on the principle, we will see the modalities. We will work. I am going to get nearer to Damien. I have already thought about the modus operandi, so we will manage. OK?

So I have well noted the two: Webinar and summary note.

Third idea, it is the working group. Can we, already establish a working group so that we can afterwards set up a schedule that will take into account the summary note, the Webinar and the working group?

Let us speed up if I may say.

Damien, could you be part of the working group that will work on the French-speaking proposals?

Louis?



CHANTAL LEBRUMENT: Well I am also interested, perhaps.

EMMANUEL: So Louis, Chantal; Let us give them a round of applause.

Other positions?

It is my understanding that there is also Arsène Tungali who says: I would also like to be part of this working group. From the DRC. Arsène Tungali. OK. So Arsène, well noted, Arsène is in the group. Other interested persons?

We would like to have a group of five persons, if you don't mind. Don't be shy. Aziz, interested? Yes! Why not Aziz? So Aziz is in the group.

PARTICIPANT: Mr. President, would you be so kind as to mention how you are going to phrase the group's charter?

EMMANUEL: Yes. The charter will be drawn up after the meeting. [Marzouc] – Alain will – as there is still – Louis is already in...

Behind, there are ladies who might be interested. Ah. You do not want to get involved. But we need involvement, especially from young ladies like you.

PARTICIPANT: I work. I have many other commitments.



EMMANUEL: You work. You have other commitments.

We are looking for the last person and I would have preferred -

I am thinking in particular of the women. That is why I am speaking to the women and Séverine might be interested.

SEVERINE WATERBLEY: Look. It is frankly difficult for a government. For us, it is difficult because apart from taking stock of the situation, we cannot take position along one line or another. Moreover [inaudible], is there, so -

EMMANUEL: I still have a concern. If I may. Governments do have opinions. When we are in the stakeholder system, the presence of the governments is also needed to bring the sensitivity of the governments. Governments should not desert.

We are aware of the fact that there are internal procedures to have opinions and others. But the governments participating in the GAC have a certain number of ideas. Governmental sensitivity should maybe be brought in an overall consideration.

SEVERINE WATERBLEY: Well I do have a concern on that, because the Belgian positions, they are taken by my Minister, by the Belgian government. They are negotiated within the European Commission of the European Union. We



align in general. We have long discussions. Knowing the partners, you know it is not always easy. So we do not get out of that mandate either.

Once we have the conclusions of the Council, we have to comply to such conclusions. So, I have no worries. But I would say that I am in no IANA group. So I am not the source of information. I have no problem in transmitting the information but from there on, to be able to influence, because we are clearly talking about this Emmanuel. Well, I have reservations in this respect.

LOUIS HOULE:

As additional information, if you join that group to bring in fact a vision of your government or documentation from your government, without going into the political elements. I have worked 30 years in the government. I think I would know how to ask you questions which would not put you on the spot.

EMMANUEL:

I think we should proceed as we have only fifteen minutes left. Unless we could have 30 minutes. Jean-Jacques, I don't know if it is possible. It is not possible? OK.

So, regarding government concerns, it is just a matter of contribution to an overall discussion [inaudible] and afterwards, it would not be the position of Séverine; it would be a position of the French-speaking community at the level of ICANN.



SEVERINE WATERBLEY: Look. You can include me in the group. No worries. I will anyway bring my input on the major principles; it is always the same major principles that come back and we all agree.

At some point, if I feel I do not agree with a suggested context, I will tell you that I do not have a mandate to do -

LOUIS HOULE: But I do not see the charter of this working group as an adaptation of a position.

I see as a first step, some sort of an information document that will be well structured and that would allow feeding the consideration further to the conclusions of the documents, and not an announcement of a joint position. We are not yet there, probably. Besides, Damien explained it very well. Right now, there is a complicity in the discussions, such a complicity that if someone has already taken position on this... Having followed the debates from the beginning, I would be at loss because right now, it is a debate that is very "American-American".

And I think that finally we are still upstream in our thinking on a Francophone position on the matter. Let us not put the cart before the horse.

EMMANUEL: I think we will proceed with the other items. I would like to proceed quickly.

Now concerning the third item. As rapid information, for some time now, there are discussions on the protection of the geographic names.



In fact, the main idea is how to review the new gTLD Applicant Guidebook, so as to protect more the geographic names, given the malfunctioning seen in the last few years.

In any case, concerning the first round, there has been a lot of malfunctioning with regard to the geographic names. Today, there are proposals on the table to strengthen the possibility for the community and the local authorities to have a scrutiny right, the possibility of objection when it is not in the public interest. The idea is that the French-speaking community supports such objection and enriches the proposals to be able to protect the geographic names, the geographic indicators and to avoid in the future such concerns as the ones we had to face with .vin and .wine, that we had to manage at the level of .spa. We had real concerns. The example I always give my Senegalese friends is the following. I say that if somebody wanted the .[toubu] without asking for the opinion of the community [inaudible] and if on the .[toubu] they started to develop a certain number of adult activities, I do not know if [inaudible] will remain another two weeks.

They tell me it is 48 hours!

These are very sensitive issues and it depends on the countries. If we become aware of it, we will mobilize more at that level.

The second element of information concerns the International Organization Identifiers. The GAC had taken position on these issues through several communiqués to ensure greater protection, because the main idea is to say that the states have already invested funds to set up these International Organizations. And there is a certain number of International Standards that protect the names and identifiers of the



International Organizations. It is necessary to make sure that this is protected in the context of the new gTLD and that the International Organizations are not compelled to spend more public funds to enter lengthy legal and other procedures in the context of ICANN.

I think that .Africa knows this only too well.

How to make sure that the International Organizations are not faced with this type of difficulties?. It seems that the discussion began to drag on and to take other directions because the President of the GAC has received a letter from ICANN saying that at the level of the GAC, positions are not well established and there are internal discussions, whereas the GAC had taken a certain number of positions. This led the actors of the International Organizations to react very clearly and say that there is a problem at that level.

I think that we want to request the engagement of the French-speaking community with regard to the protection of the International Organizations names since the OIF (Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie) is directly concerned by this debate.

LOUIS HOULE:

Just a little matter. In fact, it could be a request for information. Because I do not know what is the current state as far as you are concerned. But on the part [inaudible], at home, the issue is that right now the governments have not yet reached the Internet era and they believe that the protection of geographic names is not the responsibility of the Geographical Names Board, neither in Quebec nor in Canada, etc.



I am saying this because it is the reality. As for the action, on the part of ISOC Quebec, it is simply to tell them, listen, wake up, it makes no sense to say you do not protect a geographic name because we are talking about Internet and not about paper. It is that sketchy. And that incomprehensible. Besides, if I'm telling you this, it is not very advantageous for Quebec or Canada, but I do not know the situation at your side. Is it more or less the same? There is no debate, no interest to put forward a position that would be more globalized, shared.

I have no relevant information. . [Inaudible] I followed it for Quebec, where the question was raised.

EMMANUEL:

I can tell you that it is the same everywhere. It is everywhere the same.

There is no mobilization at the level of the governments for such issues. Therefrom, one of the proposals concerning the strategic orientation memos. [Inaudible] produces a certain number of memos on these issues and [make them understandable] at the level of the governments so that the governments take more [inaudible].

So, overall, the situation is the same except for the governments stung last time by our friends and where the awareness became very strong.

Séverine would like to take the floor.

SEVERINE WATERBLEY:

I have not introduced myself. I am Séverine Waterbley and I represent Belgium within the GAC. The Belgian government awareness has been heightened since we have two applicants who asked for the registration



of .spa. Now, everybody knows that Spa is a city, now world famous. But it is true that there were spas [inaudible] and this kind of things.

The concern, I am not turning over Jean-Jacques, is that ICANN has decided without motivation whatsoever and in a totally unilateral manner that .spa was a common noun and not a geographic name. It is true that this is the case in the United States and in Asia but in Europe, Spa refers to the city of Spa. So ICANN has already ruled out the possibility of a geographic name application whereas one of the two applicants, Asian as a matter of fact, had himself identified the geographic nature of the name. All this to say that now that the new resolutions on new geographic names are coming, it is now that it is clearly necessary to be very accurate.

The GAC will discuss it, I think on Wednesday, since Argentina has submitted a report. This report is a compromise that is not fully satisfactory for Belgium to the extent that it does not clearly identify that there should be a compulsory and prior agreement of the local authorities.

That's it. It is somehow the warning point. On our part, of course, we go for .spa going to auction. So we are already quite unhappy with the wording. We had a correspondence with the Board but this is not the point. But the government intervened to say that there was a geographic aspect, there was a public interest and this has not been taken into account by the ICANN.

It is a sketch of the situation today. You were saying it with humor, but .spa makes also reference to massages. So if tomorrow there are porn sites on .spa, there will be no revolution in the city of Spa, I think, but it



will somehow pose a problem in terms of image of the city since it is a city based on a thalassotherapy activity with many first class hotels.

Just to explain the fact that the city itself did not want to register the domain name; it has 10,000 inhabitants. So we do not ask 10,000 inhabitants to bear a budget such as the one asked by ICANN. It is also that. Maybe the communities are aware. The governments at least. But, on the other hand, for every small entity, it is impossible to take part in the acquisition of a domain name and to manage it.

PARTICIPANT: 2.5 million dollars.

EMMANUEL: I think that the main idea already emerging from this debate at the level of the GAC is that we have to work so that to be explicit on the principle of the compulsory and prior agreement of the local authorities, to be able to advocate this during the discussion at the level of the GAC.

And when the discussions arise at the level of other constituencies of ICANN, to advocate a quality and make sure that preciseness is achieved. So that afterwards, no other interpretations can pose a problem. Can we agree on this? OK.

We proceed to item four.

JEAN-JACQUES: Just to confirm Emmanuel. We can stay a little bit longer.



EMMANUEL: We can stay a little bit longer. OK.

PARTICIPANT: A proposal. Given the importance of the issue, I suggest that those who have had the experience write a summary note so that we could spread the information at the level of the French-speaking space to raise the awareness of the other members. It could be a good idea.

SEVERINE WATERBLEY: No problem. With pleasure.

EMMANUEL: Séverine can prepare a note on this. Thank you Séverine.

[PAUL MARCIAL]: [Paul Marcial] [inaudible] from Central Africa.

I just got a small idea. You suggested that the states can give their opinion beforehand. I think that in terms of generic TLD, it is a matter of business. Maybe the idea will also come up upon the result of the auction. The states that would have ceded their geographic name would get part of the earnings as a compensation, something like that. If they cannot keep the name.

Because here, the example of Belgium is clear. They will go to auction. 2.5 millions.



EMMANUEL: I suggest that you withdraw first your proposal. We will have the opportunity to discuss it when we will move forward in the discussions. I would like to make the following suggestion in terms of time management. Because I know that there is a lot of enthusiasm behind all this. Could we forgo this debate now?

Noted that for a broader information of the French-speaking public and of the actors, even the governmental ones, we could do another distribution.

On the case of the interpretation of the rules of delegation -

LOUIS HOULE: Excuse me. So what is the conclusion? Do we have a wording to suggest for the previous item?

EMMANUEL: Yes. Two things.

Already, she has offered to prepare a background note. Secondly, concerning the discussions that will begin for example for the GAC next Wednesday, it is important, during that meeting, to support the idea of a compulsory and prior agreement of the local authorities.

These are the two points I have noted down during our discussion.

Fourth item, it concerns the case of [inaudible] the rules of delegation of the national extensions to operators. I would like to invite our friend Laurent to update us.



LAURENT FERRALI:

Good evening. Laurent Ferrali from the Ministry of Economy, Finance and Digital Industry. Quite impressive, isn't it?

[Inaudible]

Well. Very quickly as time is running and it is not a topic that will occupy us a lot I think. I hope.

A working group of the ccNSO, the body that gathers ccTLD managers, has submitted a report to the ccNSO at the Los Angeles meeting. A report that has to do with the framework of interpretation of the rules of delegation and re-delegation of [inaudible] registration of ccTLD.

As governments and as members of the GAC, we are to see the ccNSO tomorrow morning to talk about this report. There was mention of the GAC endorsing this report before the ccNSO sends it to the Board. As it is, we are not going to endorse it I think, because it will cause us a certain number of problems. You must know that it is a report on the regulation rules [incomprehensible as transcription], prepared by persons under a charter. So it is always somewhat odd, somewhat exotic.

There are many points that disturb us. In short, there is a problem of articulation, to remain polite, with the rules presented by the GAC with regard to the ccTLD, the delegation and the re-delegation. More generally, it seems to us that the wording in this report calls into question the sovereignty of the states over the management of their ccTLD.

We see that this report gives a very important role to the IANA for the validation of delegation and re-delegation. It tends to be protective with



respect to the opinions of incumbent operators. Often, the incumbent operator gives its "consent" to the re-delegation. There are many points that disturb us. So we are going to remind them that it is not in line with the GAC Principles that recognized the sovereign right of states. In the preamble of the GAC Principles. I think that points 1 and 2 explained that this document was public policy but there was a principle of [inaudible]. That what counted was the national framework for each ccTLD.

That's it. To be clear, it is something which seems to us in contradiction with the principles set out by the GAC.

Moreover, there is a contradiction with the principle of sovereignty of states over their ccTLD. Because as things stand, if this framework, if this report of interpretation is adopted and used, there will be clear conflicts both with the national rules and then possibly with the rules defined within the GAC. As such, it does not ensure the stability and security of the Internet. That's it.

EMMANUEL:

Thank you Laurent. I do not know if there have been reactions with regard to [inaudible] in other constituencies. This report has also been submitted for discussion, in any case it was published for comments. Comments were made generally. I also think that there is a summary in English sent by [inaudible] that shows that the comments are negative, generally. Because it is about making sure that the actors already in place, the incumbent actors be in position to prevent the re-delegation.



It was to say, here it is, we can accept the application of the national laws when the national laws exist. But if we have a look on the French-speaking space, we notice that in many countries, there is no law. So there is a risk somewhere that the resources will be captured by some actors in breach of the very principles of sovereignty, given that the ccTLD and in particular the national domain names are vectors of sovereignty with respect to our countries.

Yes. Séverine?

SEVERINE WATERBLEY:

Just to clarify that in my country there is a legal framework. In fact, there is a legislation since 2012 that regulates the issue in case of default of the national registry.

EMMANUEL:

I think that this framework should also be shared. If you could send it via the mailing list and share it with everybody, knowing that in a while, Stéphane is going to present to us very quickly the Swiss framework. This is an input to the exchanges within our space so that it could serve as inspiration in the development of such frameworks in other countries.

[Ridwan]:

[RIDWAN]:

Thank you. I would like to thank Laurent for having presented the quintessence of the debates on that item of the GAC agenda.



My question is the following: is the GAC going to comment on the content of this report? Because from what I understood, there will be some reference to this report in the GAC communiqué. To my opinion, the scope of this communication should be as reduced as possible. The GAC should not congratulate itself but only take note of the report without going into the details.

Thank you.

EMMANUEL: Laurent?

LAURENT FERRALI: Yes. Thank you [Ridwan].

In fact, we are compelled to talk about it because these are [inaudible] ccNSO and they transmitted to us a document. So we have to talk about it. Some members of the GAC were suggesting amendments to this report. But as [inaudible] ultimately in principle, [inaudible] ask for a final document. And since it is not a document written by the GAC, but by the ccNSO working group. On the other hand, this does not mean that, in the future, we are not going to work jointly with the ccNSO to draw up a document that would be more consensual.

EMMANUEL: With this respect, conclusion of Laurent. Ah. There is a question.



PARTICIPANT: I just wanted to ask if the GAC had proposals concerning all the missing points, because we can see that there are discrepancies. But we could also make suggestions to correct the text.

Well, I understand it is not possible. I will ask a last question. In this case, I think that Laurent has insisted on two points he considers significant. If the text is approved, which are the great risks that we could encounter in the future?

LAURENT FERRALI: Once again, thank you for the question.

Once again, it is a report on the interpretation of the rules. Emmanuel has well explained the danger. It was rather him who explained it. There are countries that have very explicit legal and regulatory frameworks. In this framework, I doubt that the IANA would find fault in those countries and would question the delegations.

On the other hand, in the case of countries where the legal framework is unclear, where there is some competition between various authorities for the management of ccTLD, there, ICANN could decide to reserve and avoid [inaudible]. It is logical. It could decide, or the ICANN community could also decide to follow the interpretation rules.

It is difficult to say how to use a document the format of which is quite exotic, because the interpretation rules, I do not see very well the legal value of this kind of document. So it is difficult to figure out what purpose can this document have in practice, in the future. But I agree with Emmanuel. I think that the real problem is for the countries without a clear legal framework, or in the countries with possible



disputes between the various Ministries or other agencies in terms of delegation and re-delegation. That's it.

EMMANUEL:

In fact, the major conclusion of this debate is to encourage our countries to put in place relevant legal frameworks. It is essential for us and it contributes to the construction of Internet ecosystems.

So we are going to work on the setting up of frameworks at the level of the countries and also, maybe, on having a relevant regional legislation. Because when we take most of the countries of the French-speaking space, they actually belong to other types of constituencies, ECOWAS, CEMAC, European Union and others.

In this framework also, we could ask and get close to some authorities for the setting up of legal frameworks and make sure that these spaces be better structured. Again, we can see the benefit of participating in an international meeting. It enables us to realize what is going on on the international level and to take measures internally so as to be able to manage any possible malfunctions. I say possible. Because it could also be positive sometimes.

So, the main conclusion as far as we are concerned, is to encourage the setting up of relevant national frameworks, as you represent several countries. I think that these ideas must be developed internally [inaudible] of what is happening at the international level and explain the necessity to guide these processes.

I would like to invite Stéphane to take the floor now.



STEPHANE:

I will try to be brief then. [Inaudible] I work at the Swiss Federal Office of Communications which dealt with the creation of a Swiss regulation on Internet Domains.

I agree with what has been said here earlier. It is absolutely necessary that each country dispose of a regulation concerning its ccTLD because, in my country in any case, it is considered as a public resource that should be managed as such, as a public resource. And it is important to reassert this sovereignty vis-à-vis ICANN in particular. We have seen in the current context that there are interpretation rules that could lead to some decisions being taken not by the state or the authorities but by [inaudible] the IANA function operator [inaudible].

It is also in that context that we wanted to reassert the sovereignty of Switzerland first with regard to its ccTLD, for us .ch, and then to clarify the relevant rules.

It is also about the state having actually the control over its Internet space. It is also about that. To have the control over its Internet space. And to pick up on what has been said in the beginning, that is to say the promotion of the Francophonie, if we refocus that in the context of ICANN, it also joins the fact that French-speaking parties take also space on the Internet Domains. In this context, I do not know how many French-speaking Internet Domains have been submitted or are in the perspective of promoting the Francophonie.

If we refocus this with respect to ICANN, being in this context, we have a good element for thought, that is to say to see if we can promote the

Francophonie through particular Domain names. Basically and for each country, it is first of all about promoting the country, the culture through its ccTLD.

What is maybe particular to the Swiss context, is that we asked for .swiss, S-W-I-S-S, which is eventually an adjective but which was not protected in the context of the first round, of the first call for tender for Domain names, since the latter was about country names only. Therefore, for Switzerland, it would have been the Swiss Confederation, or Suisse, or Switzerland. Which means that the adjective was not protected as such and this compelled us to react eventually. We were compelled to submit an application that was defensive, I would say, because it aimed at avoiding that companies, especially American ones highly interested by the Domain name could do business. Because the .swiss as such was a good brand as we say, that could have been exploited.

We submitted our application and we finally got the .swiss. Now, we had to do something. This something translates into doing some sort of promotion or Internet showcase for Switzerland, for its businesses, for its culture. Indeed, we will set the conditions that are relatively restrictive with respect to the assignment of the Domain name. It will be reserved for Swiss businesses, in principle. Which means the businesses having head offices in Switzerland, having a real administration in Switzerland. In a second phase, most likely, we will open this to Swiss citizens, to Swiss nationals.

There is an extremely strong link that will be made with respect to Switzerland.



In this context, our idea was also to distinguish the .swiss as a showcase of Switzerland from the .ch because we had always comprehended the .ch in an open manner. Anyone can ask for a .ch and obtain it without having a particular link to our country. The .ch has a relatively low cost while the .swiss will be much more expensive because there will be controls.

It is also about creating a secure space with respect to .swiss; to have a quality Domain also in terms of security. People who obtain a .swiss have a real relation to Switzerland and will use it from this perspective, aiming at promoting Switzerland, its businesses, its culture and its various languages. We were talking about the Francophonie. Obviously our country is French-speaking as well as German-speaking and Italian-speaking. We can use this instrument to promote our country.

I think that this is also an element of thought for the other countries. It links up with the protection of geographic names mentioned earlier. Because we have been compelled to do it. It was the adjective. We had not thought that people would rather have the idea to ask for the adjective and not for the name as such.

So it is an element of thought for the future rounds where one should really consider the problems linked to the geographic names.

The problem as I see it is mainly a problem of delimitation. How far do we go. How do we actually delimit the protection. Because at the end of the day, all names, especially the geographic ones, have several meanings. They could be brands, or other things. In this context, which are the conflict rules we are going to set up when we have a geographic



name, a cultural one. Because it will likely go further than the simple geographic names. We have to know how to protect them.

And also, finally, how to communicate the message to the concerned parties. The parties concerned should also get the information, be aware of the fact that there is an application and how they could protect themselves. I think that in this context the information process is fundamental, as well as the conflict rules and the delimitation rules. What would be covered under the geographic protection.

To come back to the decree. We regulated .ch in our Swiss law because it is vital at the level of the national sovereignty. But we also regulated .swiss which is a generic name and falls, in principle, within the competence of ICANN.

In any case, ICANN establishes the main rules. But we, actually, looked for the limit. And ICANN, ultimately, does not establish many rules concerning the Domains. You are relatively free, afterwards, to determine the purposes of your Domain. You are also free to determine the conditions of the assignment. As I said with respect to .swiss, we are going to set relatively restrictive conditions. - Yes, exactly, the Registry. The Registry will be able to set the purposes of its Domain and will also be able to set the assignment conditions. It will be able to set some contributions with respect to the registrars; who are the registrars?

We see here that we are the registrar as such; it is mentioned in this decree. Exactly, we regulate all these questions at the legal level because we are a public authority, ultimately. It is the Swiss State that has - [inaudible].



[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

