**Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Country/Territory Names as TLDs
TRANSCRIPT**

Monday 16 March 2015 at 2000 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ccwg-unct-16mar15-en.mp3

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#mar

Attendees:

ccNSO

Ron Sherwood, .vi
Annebeth Lange, .no
Mirjana Tasic, .rs
Laura Hutchison, .uk
Joke Braeken, .eu
Grigori Saghyan, .am
Paul Szyndler, .au
Mary Uduma, .ng
Jordi Iparraguirre, ccNSO Council NomCOm Appointee

GNSO
Heather Forrest, IPC (Co-Chair)
Carlos Raul Guttierez, NPOC
Maxim Alzoba, NTAG
Griffin Barnett, IPC
Colin O'Brien, IPC
Robin Gross, NCSG

At-Large
Cheryl Langdon-Orr

ISO
Jaap Akkerhuis

Apologies:
Susan Payne, IPC
Patrick Jones

ICANN staff:
Marika Konings
Bart Boswinkel
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: This call is being recorded.

Speakers, you may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much Bryan. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. And welcome to the CTWG on country and territory names that gTLD has called on the 16th of March, 2015.

On the call today we have Heather Forrest, Grigori Saghyan, Annabeth Lange, Maxim Alzoba ,Mary Uduma, Carlos Gutierrez, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Joke Braecken, Paul Szyndler, Mirjana Tasic , Collin O'Brien, Jaap Akerhuis, Laura Hutchison, Robin Gross and Griffin Barnnett. We have received apologies from Susan Payne and Patrick Jones. And from staff we have Lars Hoffman and myself, Nathalie Peregrine

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. And my apologies, I see that Bart Boswinkel has also joined us from staff.

Thank you so much, and over to you Heather.

Heather Dryden: (Natalie), thank you very, very much. This is our call of the cross community working group on country and territory names. And thank you all for being here very much. My co-chairs have asked me to chair this morning's meeting despite the very early hour here in Australia. So we'll see how I go.

What I would like to do first is acknowledge our agenda which is in the Adobe room. And we have some folks who are not on the Adobe room, so I'll very quickly run through that in audio form. We have just completed our welcome.

Our second agenda item is to discuss and confirm agreement - perhaps that's a bit heavy handed - but discuss Section 1 of the options paper that we're looking at on the screen, although it's just gone a little bit funky on my screen. We'll have a substantive discussion on two letter strings which is Section 2 of the options paper. And then we'll do some housekeeping at the end - any other business, and confirm our next meeting.

So beginning with Section1 of the options paper - and Lars, you might be struggling to put it up on your screen in Word form. I know we have a hard time with pdf, and that's look good - so far, so good. The only problem with that is that's the wrong document. There we are.

Lars Hoffman: I'm sorry. I'm just putting up the red line - just one second, I'm sorry.

Heather Dryden: No, you're fine.

Lars Hoffman: I had a different red line document up there that wasn't the right one - I apologize.

Heather Dryden: No, that's quite all right. It looked significantly more advanced than our document, which maybe means we'll take that one instead.

So you'll recall...

((Crosstalk))

Heather Dryden: Go ahead Lars.

Lars Hoffman: No. I was just going to say significantly shorter though, so that's a probably a good thing to put up the correct one.

Heather Dryden: Never mind. And you'll - as Lars fiddles with the document - I'll provide a bit of background here just for context. You'll recall that this is a document that was initially tabled in Singapore in our face to face meeting, and put forward as a path if you like for how we complete our work - how we deliver our work under our charter.

And what occurred in Singapore is that this front page of the document got left off in the printout that we discussed. And so we brought it forward to our last conference - phone conference two weeks ago, and asked members to have a look at the top end of the document, the purpose of the document, and essentially in a context to why we're using this particular document and how we're using this particular document.

We asked members to go away, provide any comments on the top end of the document if they had any, and those comments were very helpfully compiled by Lars from ICANN staff. And you'll see that this is the document in front of us.

And I believe Lars, the only thing that we can't see in this version is there were a few comments and questions off in the margin, and we don't see those. If we could see them in the view, that would be very helpful. And I wonder are they...

Lars Hoffman: Heather, this is Lars. I just want to quickly interject. In the first section here on Page 102 - purpose - there were no comments. But here in this field - your next steps - there were a couple of questions and corrections on colors. And then the comments will follow Section 1 here on the two letter codes

Heather Dryden: Good, marvelous. Thank you Lars.

So we'll start with the top end of the document which as I say is the purpose of the document. And I will open the floor to anyone who has any further comments. And I would like to clarify this - that our discussion today insofar as we do agree that this is an acceptable text, that does not close off the text for further revision.

It simply means that as of today we are happy with the text as we see it, and feel that it accurately represents what we are doing. So to the extent that anyone has any comments, then I would be very happy to have those raised now.

And (Carlos), I see your question in the Chat - what document is this? Have I answered that question for you? Oh no, that was the previous - that's right. That was the previous document that Lars was showing. So I think probably we have that cleared up.

And Ron, I notice you joined. Welcome. All right. Perhaps Lars, what we could since we have some comments and questions on the second page, maybe we focus our time there because it doesn't seem to be anything controversial here on the front page.

Then if we have a look at some of the questions that we have in terms of next steps - and this is setting a roadmap for our work. We're saying the CWG builds on the results of the ccNSO study group on country and territory names. In its final report the study group presented three key areas that can benefit from a harmonized, coherent framework across the ccTLD and cTLD name space to address the issues in these areas.

And the comment from (Carlos) is there should be a better word than areas here. And I agree (Carlos). It's a matter of finding the right terminology. Let's say areas that could benefit here presented in three - perhaps we say something as specific as uses of country and territory names or instances of the use of country and territory names so that we're absolutely specific as to

what we're talking about. Let's fiddle with that language I think and try to come back with something a bit clearer.

And then we say two letter country codes, three letter country codes, and country and territory names either in the short form or full length form - long or full length form. And I think that's - those are good changes that help us out.

The status quo of policy treatment - and I might suggest we even say the status quo of policy - policy addressing the use of country and territory names or something like this. I think to the extent that we keep pulling ourselves back to country and territory names - that will be a helpful thing.

And then there's a question here on the use of harmonized versus consistent. (Anna Beth), would you like to - and (Anna Beth) - just so everyone is aware - (Anna Beth) is rather ill and will limit her comments to the Chat. So Paul, for your purposes since you're not on the Adobe, I'll read them out.

It says for C - and C relates to the three areas of scope - there should be both short and long forms in my view. And I think (Anna Beth), that's certainly the agreement. There's no question that we're dealing with both short and long form. It's just a matter of how we identify what name we give those things, whether it's short and long form. (Carlos) has suggested adding the words long or full length. It's just a matter of capturing how we know exactly what those names are. Hopefully that allays your concerns.

(Anna Beth), thank you very much. Look, I think we can do a bit of non-controversial wordsmithing here. There's nothing necessarily substantive in what we're talking about shy of - to the extent that we shift away from for example long and short form which is not what we're suggesting we do.

So I think what we'll do is we'll take this away. And I'm happy to work with Lars. We'll do a bit of tinkering on this end and make this a bit more specific.

The only other thing that I would suggest that we add to this is up at the top that we include the - in the reference on the front page - to the final report of the study group on country and territory names - which we very clearly include - where is the reference that I suggest we added in?

Sorry, on this page in the second dot point there - issues arising in relation to developing a consistent framework. Issues noted in the ccNSO study group report, I think we might do well to either pull those out from the study group, although perhaps that's better done in the substantive sections, or at least provide the URL.

I know we've done it on the front page. But I think that to the extent that this document can stand alone, that would be helpful because there's a very different context between the two documents. The ccNSO formed a study group. This is a cross community working group. And to the extent that we can encapsulate our work into a single document here, I think that would be helpful given the cross community nature of this - that it doesn't point to any single SO or AC within the ICANN community. So that would be my suggestion for how we go about things.

I would also suggest that as we go, it's perhaps not necessary at this point in time, and indeed it would be very hard to do it at this point in time. But I think we also ought to add to the extent that this document becomes our initial and perhaps final report depending on how we go, that we add in this top end section a bit about the methodology - how we have then carried out our work under this, who we've spoken to, what we've done, how we've progressed.

I see some comments in here about providing the URL and this sort of thing. Let's play with the top end. I think that's helpful comments. Play with the top end and make it as fulsome as it needs to be without repeating ourselves.

So with that in mind - as I say, I don't think we're in a place now to talk about the methodology because we're only just beginning in terms of delivering on

the methodology. So once we have something to say here, I think this is a logical place to put it. So we might just put a placeholder to come back to at a later point.

And Cheryl, I'm just holding for your comment. And then we might move on. Cheryl agreed to adding methodology section here as well, and to placeholders. That's very helpful. Thank you.

So Lars, perhaps if you know - that one I see you're typing - if we can add that in to the document. And perhaps you and I can work together. We'll clean up these issues. We'll put forward for our next meeting some suggestions and see where we are.

If anyone has any objection to proceeding on the basis of the text on the top end section there that you have in front of you - the purpose and next steps - I would be grateful to hear your comments now so that we might address them before our next meeting. That said, I understand that it's very difficult to drat on the fly. So if you prefer simply to add a placeholder here in the Chat and say I'd like to come back - I'd like to add some comments in writing - then that would be fine.

I don't see anyone rushing to comment here. So what we'll do is we'll say this, we'll note in the meeting - in our record of the meeting - that we discussed the top end or reviewed the top end. It hasn't really been discussion. And in it silence seems to have agreed that this is a reasonable text for working forward, and with the opportunity to make changes as we progress.

All right then, I suppose we shall challenge ourselves and go to substance which is the second part of our discussion today, and it is the next item on our agenda. And you'll recall that what we agreed to do was to begin with two letter country codes, to work through the analysis here, and then take things section by section starting with status quo.

And that includes reasons and justifications for the status quo to the extent that we can find any evidence as to why decisions were taken early on to justify the status quo - that that would be very helpful. And there have been some comments in relation to the top end of the document - and I've suggested that they be plugged in here - that in this discussion of the two letter country codes, you may recall if you were on our last call, there was some suggestion that we put in here the history around two letter codes.

We have some folks on our group with some expertise in that. And (Yap), if you would like to raise your hand, please go right ahead. It's a perfect time.

(Yap Acahute): I wish to (unintelligible) write up something about the history of how these codes came into - to be used for TLDs. And I - after we - it took some more time than I initially expect - spent all weekend on it. And I immediately done with the text of this which is some of the history. I will - I plan to send it out tomorrow so - to the list. And then that at least - that will be the first draft of that.

Heather Dryden: (Yap), that's wonderful.

((Crosstalk))

(Yap Acahute): ...a lot of effort. And while I'm at it, that is just that I - everybody can of course comment on it - comment on it. And while I'm at it, I actually would like to send in a suggestion as well to have a definition of what is (unintelligible) lists. Because I mean, it's not really a list. It's a standard which contains a couple of lists. And we all know which part of the list we mean. But we probably should at least once really specify it more accurately. And I will do that tomorrow as well.

Heather Dryden: That's very helpful - very helpful indeed (Yap). And thank you for adding your expertise to the group. I think that significantly adds to the robustness of what

we're doing. So much appreciated, and acknowledging that it's taking you some time. But we're very grateful for your time in this regard. You have some key input that will add significantly. So thank you very much.

Okay. With that in mind, we'll plug that work into this section. Rather than the top end of the document, I think it's more logical - I'm happy to hear others' comments on this - but it makes sense to put that information here under two letter codes, specifically under two letter codes since that is indeed the status quo and the historical justification for why two letter codes were reserved.

And one thing I would like to put forward to the group is indeed picking up on comments just made by (Yap) is that we try - we aim as best we can for precision - that this document given that we are the first group - the first cross community group to be constituted on this particular topic. And the topic is of very significant interest.

It behooves us to be as precise as possible in our use of language. And indeed I would like to see ultimately as we go - and perhaps it's an organic thing that builds into the document that we have a definitions section, and that any definitions are captured in that section - if you like a glossary at the start of it and the end of the document that enables a clear and consistent reading of this.

And indeed ISO 3166 list could be a place for that discussion. On the other hand if you think it's not so much a definition as it is an explanation of that document, then I think that would be very helpful. (Anna Beth), I note your comment there that you think that's a good idea. Thank you very much. And I also see that(Jordy) has joined us - and welcome to you.

I suppose then what we can do is in our comments to the extent that we see a term that needs to be pulled out for definition - we already have some inline definitions in what we have - that we start a section that pulls those out let's

say and drops them into an appropriate place. And that insures consistent use throughout the document.

And (Carlos) says in the Chat it's a very good idea. I think the risk here is that the terminology has - many of the terms that we're using have multiple uses and/or I think one thing that this group has noted on a number of occasions - we have terms that have been used and used inconsistently or even used incorrectly by folks who were well meaning but simply don't know what the proper terminology is or the proper explanation is. And this is a very good opportunity to clarify that.

And (Carlos) notes we have the GAC study as well, and I agree. To the extent that we have any - if you like any dissidence across the community in terms of what a term means or what a group's understanding a term means is, then I think that needs to be noted here as well. Because that then, given this is a community - a cross community working group, I think it's equally useful to note where there is not agreement as to what a term means as to know whether it is in agreement. So that's one recommendation that I'll make to adding into our document. And I suppose we'll pick that up for the next time.

Would anyone like to - (Carlos), you've made a few comments here in the document. We don't have (Patrick) with us today. And (Anna Beth), we'll pick up your question about EU in a moment. But (Carlos), would you like to add anything to clarify in relation to your question - your comment?

(Carlos Gutierrez):   Thank you Heather. This is (Carlos) speaking. Just a comment - reading the document I went back to the ISO list. And strangely enough the lists are just a list of codes. There is not official list of names. And later in the paper somebody says let's use the same list of names.

Well I worry a little bit. We have to be very careful about the ISO list and the exact definition of the ISO list because the way I found it in the web was just

a list of codes. And they don't try to relate to names in any specific language. So this is one thing that when we finish this two letter codes, we have to agree that those are codes and they are in no way related to the name of a country in any specific language because we don't do that, we will lose a lot of time. That was my impression and that's why I was trying to slim down the language to the necessary. Thank you Heather.

Heather Dryden: Well thank you (Carlos). And (Yap), I see your hand up. And then we'll follow with (Miriama).

(Yap Acahute): This is (Yap) for the record. I'm not sure about what list (Carlos) is talking about. But ISO standard is not available on the web. He might be referring to some Wikipedia, and that one is plainly wrong. So we need to be very precise when we talk about this list. And the authoritative list from - which is inside the ISO 6166, but one standard is the one we meant here.

There are a couple of other lists running around on the net, and that (unintelligible) complete, but also wrong. So again this is really preciseness.

Heather Dryden: Thank you (Yap). I appreciate that.

(Yap Acahute): And that one - to add to that one, that is not on that list (unintelligible) it contains long names and short names. It has other details as well which I am not authoritative. And so that's another thing we have to worry about - the definition of long and short names because sometimes they're taking from DUN database, sometimes they're made up. So we really have to be - we really want to be precise. Being precise is what I'm aiming for here.

Heather Dryden: Understood (Yap) - thank you very much.

(Paul Schindler): Heather, can I jump in here? Sorry. It's (Paul) - sorry to interrupt you. But I don't have a virtual hand to raise.

Heather Dryden: Go for it (Paul) - go for it.

(Paul Schindler): All right. Look just further to what (Yap) said, this is something - this is an issue I was conscious of because as he suggested, it's easy to hop on to Wikipedia and see a version of or information gleaned from the list. And the way the publicly information looks, it certainly focuses entirely on codes.

But (Yap) is absolutely right. There's a certain number of categories associated with it, one of which is the two letter code, then the name of the country, then whatever. And I do recall going back to ISO and actually checking their information - the way they described this list. And I remember that they said it's a set of recognized codes, letters and numbers that can be used when you to refer to countries. So that specifically is the purpose of the list.

They then clarify that they're not in the business of defining what a country is. As (Yap) has said, that's picked up by the UN terminology bulletin and others. I think if anybody is a little unclear on that, they should have looked back to the study group report because we did go into some detail, and all the links were there that provided that clarification.

But we should be clear that even from the perspective of the ISO, this is - their purpose is to link codes to countries. And then of course it just so turns out that ccTLDs were hung off that. But my understanding is that this is exactly what this list was supposed to do. So that's just my two cents worth.

Heather Dryden: Thank you (Paul). I'm mindful of the queue. And I see (Yap) has rejoined. But I'd like to allow (Miriana) to speak - so please (Miriana). I wonder if we've lost (Miriana). (Miriana), are you with us?

(Miriana Tazik): I have some problem with the link to the internet. But I hope you hear me now.

Heather Dryden: We do indeed. Thank you, yes.

(Miriana Tazik):   Okay. I am referring to the second bullet in this status quo thing. In the first sentence it is separated - the two letter country code is the reference list to ccTLD. I (unintelligible) ccTLD is asking in here. This is TLD. But I'm almost sure that this (unintelligible) of the list is only for (unintelligible) ccTLD.

(Unintelligible) ccTLD during the past (unintelligible) completely different treatment because I passed it. So I don't think ccTLD should be specified here.

Heather Dryden: (Miriana)...

(Miriana Tazik):   Can everyone hear me?

Heather Dryden: Yes. We heard you. And I wonder if (Yap) will make a comment about that. I'd like to add myself to the queue after (Yap).

(Miriana Tazik):   Yes, please.

Heather Dryden: So (Yap), please go ahead.

(Yap Acahute):   I want to add to the previous comment that I will in the note I send out tomorrow also give pointers to the official ISO day to day so that people can look at the countries and the information which is actually in standard which is publically available. And so people - that's at least authoritative data if people want to look it up and see what's available and get some information about how to use it.

The other thing yes, the ISO list is indeed only in - it's alpha. It's just ASCII codes - alpha two codes. And for IDM's versions of country names or other things, the list is only - this is actually a completely different subject. And that's (unintelligible) fast track area of IDMs. And that is - the same list is

used in another way, and it's only shared that this is used for the country being illegible for getting IDMs.

And so the codes are not then used for the country names, but other things come into play. It is just a reference. So this is completely - I mean this is unrelated to what the list itself is. I mean this is ICANN policy and a chance to do more with fast track IDM process than anything else.

And I think actually if you go further on with this paper in the options - I don't know which section is - but that's where the IDM's versions of for countries and county codes comes into play. So it's probably too much to put also under this bullet as well.

Heather Dryden: That's helpful (Yap). And (Miriana), I see your hand up. Would you like to comment further? Or is that an old...

(Miriana Tazik): Oh, I forgot to put my hand down.

Heather Dryden: No, that's quite all right. That's quite all right. And I recall - I'll add in a comment very quickly here. And I'm afraid I don't have it in front of me. But I can recall that at least one reference to - official reference to the name of the ISO 3166 list has to do with - it's specifically the name of this document.

The name of the standard has to do with English language country codes and names. And I - as I say, I don't have that full name in front of me. But I do recall that that's how I cited the document in my thesis.

(Yap Acahute): Yes

((Crosstalk))

Heather Dryden: Thank you (Yap).

(Yap Acahute): There are two versions this is - this is (Yap) - this guide. There's actually two versions. There's a French and English versions, and the names of countries are either in the English or in French language. And that is a reference to the UN term database which has all the six UN languages and of those countries.

Heather Dryden: That's helpful. That's...

(Yap Acahute): (Unintelligible) I'd say for - the codes are the same for as well as the English as the trans version of the standard.

Heather Dryden: I recall that. And it's simply the long and short form or let's say the name of the country that is identified that is - that differs between the French and the English. Excellent. All right. I think that's very helpful. And to the extent that this gets captured, I suppose the difficulty that we have - we have now some robust discussion within the group. And I suspect that there's an agreement in principle on precision here and insuring that we refer to things as accurately as we possibly can.

So I suppose the challenge that we have is capturing these comments in the onto paper in this document. And I think what we do is we look forward to (Yap)'s helpful summary of the background as he has described, and the context. And we plug that in, and that may well bring up some more questions and comments and things.

What I would like to do as well is point out (Anna Beth)'s comment here on the page that you see in front of us. Can we use dot EU as an example? And (Yoki), you very helpfully sent around an email. And I wonder if you might be willing to articulate what you said in that email here just for the benefit of everyone on the call. So (Yoki) might not have sound or might have - still on the call.

What (Yoki Baken) very helpfully offered was that she had no objection to using dot EU as an example. So that (Anna Beth) answers your question in relation to that point.

(Yoki Baken): (Unintelligible) many thanks - this is (Yoki) speaking. I have some issues with my phone indeed. But otherwise it is all right.

Heather Dryden: Fair enough - thank you very much. Sorry, I didn't - I wasn't sure if we lost you. That's wonderful. That's good that we haven't lost you and good also to hear your voice.

(Yoki Baken): Thank you.

Heather Dryden: Marvelous. So there's all sorts of chat going on in the Chat as to names of countries and how they differ and which language and this sort of thing. And I think these are all helpful and will all plague us when we get further on to names. Happily it won't plague us terribly much in relation to two letter country codes given that adds some - (Yap) has noted the codes are the same irrespective of the language of the base language of the list let's say.

The country is identified. So that will help us in some way. But there is this need to correct the reference to IDM and ASCII in our reference in the second dot point as has been very helpfully pointed out.

Now the reasons and justification section - and we may find that the actual headings of this document aren't terribly helpful. As we add information we might structure it differently. But I do believe that that is helpful if we have the background from (Yap) that that can very helpfully go there. And then that's probably logically followed by information from the new gTLD policy development process and the studies that happened there.

And (Miriana), I'm sorry - I see you have problems with your connection. If there's anything - I'll throw (Natalie) in here - if there's anything that (Natalie) can do to help you, please do let her know.

I would like the group to refer as well to - and I'm happy to circulate it on the list. I've gone back in terms of the new gTLD policy development process to a group that was similarly constituted to ours. So they had a similar charter to ours, albeit it was not a cross community working group. It was a GNSO working group on reserved names.

And one of the topics that was addressed in that reserved names working group was two letter codes. And that indeed explains the - or justifies or provides context to the decision of the GNSO to recommend that two letter codes be withheld from the first round that we've just experienced.

And (Anna Beth), I agree entirely. It's important to note that the group was not a cross community working group. I think we'll have that issue with a number of the documents that we look at that are historical. For example our study group is a ccNSO study group. We have a GNSO group on reserved names.

And I don't think the fact that it comes from any one SO or AC should deny our group from looking at it, but rather shows that we are as robustly informed as we possibly can be. And again perhaps that goes into the definition section that we make it absolutely clear the affiliation of or origin of a particular report. And hopefully that will allay any concerns.

But the reserved names working group's report - I believe is helpful to us in a sense that it is quite robust in the way that it sets out its methodology. It refers to having referenced linguistic experts, referencing technical experts and this sort of thing, bearing in mind that this was gearing up for a very unknown thing which was the expansion - significant expansion in an uncapped round of new gTLDs.

And I think that's a good model for us in methodology, not just in its substance. I also think - I've raised this with the co-chairs, and I'd like to raise it with the group. I think the way that that reserved names working group sets out its information, some of it in table format, makes some very information dense information much easier to read. And I wonder if that might be something that we adopt as well in terms of how we represent some of these points because they are quite rich. And I suspect we're leading up to a rather long report here in terms of communicating the information we have to communicate.

So I think we consider - from my point of view - I think we consider that this document is a working document. And thanks for your comments (Anna Beth) in support of that, and really come up with - not be wedded to any particular form - that we come up with the very best possible means of articulating and capturing all the great wealth of information that we have to cover.

With that in mind I would like to suggest that one thing we do before our next meeting - as I say, I'll circulate back to reserved names working group report - that we all have a look at that for two things: number one, for style - for the way that the information is presented, and number two for the content. I believe it's annex two that specifically deals with two letter - I believe it's one and two letter codes - but two letter codes.

And it provides some helpful background and even links us to particular documents that that group relied on that this group can go and have a look at and consider in its own eyes and in its own perspective. And that plus the very valuable input from (Yap) I think will add considerably to our work here in terms of what we're doing. And that way we're not just capturing our own limited purview of each member of the group, but we're looking beyond the group to others and their expertise.

And one thing I will note - and (Paul) might like to say a few comments on this - was we did have a similar outward looking focus in the study group. And I

think that added quite considerably to what we did. (Paul), if you're still on, would you comment on that point?

(Paul Schindler):   Sorry about that. I'll now unmute myself. Sorry I missed the last little comment that you made Heather. To what would you like me to comment? The outward focus of...

Heather Dryden: Yes. I think we had - the study group benefited in a significant way from looking beyond simply the knowledge and the expertise of its members. And we brought in some other parties to inform our work. And I wondered if you could comment as to how that went and whether that was a helpful exercise from your perspective.

(Paul Schindler):   Absolutely. All right, certainly. Look the - Heather is absolutely right. In a way the previous group, because it was chartered as a study group, meant that we had quite a bit of latitude in terms of - we had a charter, but there was quite a bit of latitude within there. So as issues came up, as we identified things, we were then able to head off into various directions or depths that weren't originally identified for the group but as they related broadly to our goal.

So that meant that for instance (Yap) with his previous experience with ISO became a valuable resource. And he is again because otherwise there wouldn't be anybody within the immediate community that has that experience of ISO. We could all speak theoretically about our experiences as ccTLDs or gTLDs. But he provided a level of depth and detail that, you know, greatly improved our work.

Similarly when it came to talking about the way countries and territories named themselves - and we can get - this is just generalization. I know we're talking about two letter codes at the moment. But when it came to how countries identified themselves, it became very useful to have contacts in the UN who through a reciprocal arrangement with ICANN agreed to circulate

surveys to their membership or a subset of their membership. So again we're using their expertise and the links directly into the community to gather information.

From that perspective it was - it made our work all the more robust and our findings all the more robust. And I think there's something to be learned from that, although this is a working group that is going to escalate the work of the study group and in essence take decisions in terms of recommendations. Then I think we could learn from that, and it wouldn't be inappropriate for this group to where appropriate repeat that exercise.

Again just having - using (Yap) and although he is a member of this group again provides us a sort of form of external expertise. And we should use and abuse that every way we can.

Heather Dryden: Thank you (Paul). Thank you very much for your background on that. And I think we have Patrick as well and a number of us have different touch points let's say with the issue. So to the extent that we do have expertise within the group, we avail ourselves of that. And to the extent that we want to look outside, I believe that's appropriate too.

With that in mind, does anyone have any questions or comments or concerns about any of the points that have been raised so far? We've largely limited our discussion to what you see on the screen which is the status quo which includes the reasons and the justifications.

I'm not sure we can take that too much further in substance at this point. I think what we need to do is have a think about revising this language. We include the commentary from (Yap) which we might even - I suppose there's a question as to whether we look at that separately or whether we plug that into the document. Perhaps that doesn't matter too much. And we comment more substantively on that next time.

Anyone have any concerns or questions about that proposal? I don't see any hands and I don't see any comments in the Chat. With that in mind if we scroll down to the next page, I have one sort of a non-substance I suppose, but comment in relation to the next section.

Lars, could I have you turn us to the options please? We have some comments there. And I don't know - or perhaps, is that the - issues, sorry. It was issues. Thank you. I don't know that we're perhaps in a state where we can helpfully articulate the issues or clearly articulate the issues given that I think we really need to understand the background before we articulate the issues.

My only concern is that these be articulated - any issues be articulated in as neutral language as possible - in other words that the issues aren't articulated so as to predetermine any particular outcome in the options list. And I think here again it's just precision in drafting that we point out questions or concerns, and to the extent that any particular group or member of this group or constituency or stakeholder group or supporting organization has concerns about any of these individually, that those be captured here as well.

I think once we get to issues, we get into points that for example one group or another may not agree is an issue. It's possible that we won't. It's possible that we're all willing to say that these things are issues. However, I would like to simply make very clear the point that to the extent that there is dissention in the way that these things are articulated, I think the first step, we try and achieve a wording that we can all agree with. And that is a second step if that's not possible that we articulate any concerns that come up in relation to those. And there are some comments around the issues.

What I recommend that we do - although I know it perhaps not slows us down, but it puts things off - is that we really don't attack the issues in a fulsome way until we're in a very good position with understanding the background and the context. And I would think that the information provided

by (Yap) will be very, very helpful in that regard because it will I think flush out some of the issues.

And going back to that reserved names working group, we'll - that report will also help us to trigger in our minds what other issues might be (unintelligible) to the extent that we get ourselves out of this as informed as possible as to what other groups have found here, including the study group because the study group noted a number of issues along the way.

Its report was set out in a slightly different format. But I think it's important that we go back and reconsider those as well. I don't think any of the issues that were raised in that report have gone away if you like. So we'll make this list as fulsome as possible.

And with that I have a proposal. If anyone would like to comment on the issues section now, that's more than welcome. It's not me saying let's not talk about this at all. It's just I think our discussion will be better informed once we have the background solid.

No? No comments. All right then. I will propose - we have 12 minutes to go. And there's no reason that we use the whole hour if we don't need the whole hour. Let's put out an open call for comments. Anyone want to make any substantive comments on what we've discussed today? If not, we'll leave it where we are. We'll do some drafting work. And we'll make an effort to circulate the changes to the group - let's say I'll take it on myself.

Lars, if you're able and willing to work with me, that perhaps if we try and pick up the points that were captured today that we do that maybe a week before our next call - that we do that in the next few days. And that way folks have plenty of time to then comment on a new version.

Lars, you started typing and I scared you off. Marvelous - good. So then Lars and I will take that on. We'll simply try and capture what has been discussed

today. And our next meeting - Lars, could you - I assume will be roughly a fortnight from today. Is that right?

Lars Hoffman: Thank you Heather. This is Lars. Yes, a fortnight from today, so that should be the 30th of March and which will be a different UTC time. But I'll send that around because then Europe has (unintelligible). But then I think that we maintain the current - anyway, I think it will be 19 UTC.

Heather Dryden: Marvelous. And (Natalie), we'll let you weigh in as well here in the Chat.

(Natalie Tobin):   Thirtieth of March at 1900 UTC - that's excellent. Back to you.

Heather Dryden: Thank you very much (Natalie) for confirming that. And (Carlos), please, your hand is up.

(Carlos Gutierrez):   Yes. Now that we have a few extra minutes thanks to the excellent time management by Heather, I want to recall that we had a meeting in Singapore with the GAC. And the GAC has a similar working group, subgroup or report - whatever it's called - on the protection and geographic names. And we have had two meetings in Singapore and we have had no GAC participation in this group.

I just want to note that. Do we care about that? We just continue and wait until Buenos Aeries and show them our work? Or what ideas do we have from this group about convergence or not with the GAC work on protection of geographic names? Thank you very much.

Heather Dryden: (Carlos), thank you for reminding us about this. There's some comments in the Chat. In the meantime, Lars, could you confirm this is something we discussed prior to this meeting. Did our invitation to this meeting - did that go out to the GAC chair by chance?

Yes. Lars says yes. So we made a point - the co-chairs spoke before this meeting and made a procedural point to invite members of the GAC. I can confirm on the call, I have not heard from the GAC chair or any GAC members.

(Carlos), I suspect you have not either. And (Anna Beth) is going to type in. (Anna Beth) says she has tried with her GAC representative. But it's not easy to get them involved. (Carlos), have you heard from any GAC member that they intended to...

(Carlos Gutierrez):   No. And I just want to recall that in Singapore the GAC chair said that this is a very important issue for the GAC, and that we have had troubles to get GAC members - also the GNSO groups. Everybody is a little bit overworked. But I just want to note that we cannot forget that we want to be inclusive with them at some point. Thank you.

Heather Dryden: I think that's a very good point (Carlos). And I think it certainly needs to go into the methodology - the explanation of the methodology of our group - who we reached out to and when we reached out to those people. And I think it would even be helpful to refer to transcripts of meetings to the extent that we have particular comments that are made.

I think that we need to include the comment that this group filed - that the chairs filed - in relation to the GAC proposal. Again the more fulsome this is in terms of expressing how we've gone about doing our work and who we did try to reach out, then I think that would be helpful.

And (Anna Beth), I agree entirely that we did point out in Singapore that it would be quite an unworkable outcome if we reach the end of our agreement and the GAC came to its conclusion and it was a different one - and likewise if the two groups did so entirely in parallel without any cooperation.

And (Maxim), I see your comment. I'm afraid we won't be able to avoid interruption with the relevant GAC group. That's quite true. We have indeed invited them. I don't think that - and we've done so on numerous occasions. And I would like to continue to do that - that it's absolutely crystal clear that GAC members are welcome to join us.

Us participating with them to the extent that we are not invited, I don't think that that's feasible to the extent that we are invited. And I think now the difference following Singapore is that at least a number of GAC members know that our group exists whereas previously that wasn't the case perhaps to some of our confusion.

But certainly GAC members know that we exist at this stage. We do have a mention In the GAC communique as (Anna Beth) and (Carlos) have pointed out. And that that should in theory help with cooperation. But I think we're also in a challenge - not to say that I know the inner sanctum of the GAC - but the intercessional work by the GAC is somewhat difficult - is somewhat fraught in and of itself. So it may well be that simply by means of the different approaches to the how the GAC works, that this requires face to face discussion in Buenos Aries.

And perhaps what we do is we stick with the 90 minute meeting. And we say just as a matter of course that we devote half an hour of the meeting or something like this to some sort of a sharing of information between the GAC and the - and our cross community working group.

Lars, I noticed your comment there. You make sure a note will go out to the GAC before each of our meetings, and that's very helpful. Thank you for that. Mary, we'll wait for your comment here. And if anyone has anything else to add - (Carlos), your hand is still up. Is that - would you like to offer further comment?

(Carlos Gutierrez):   Sorry. This is my old hand.

Heather Dryden: Not a problem (Carlos), not a problem. And Mary has dropped her comment off. Anyone else have any comments about that, let's say at a general principle and in terms of I assume we'll relatively soon have to scheduling BA. Does that sound reasonable that we have a standing item on the agenda that is if you like a sharing of information between the two groups, that we invite members of the GAC to provide an update and provide input, and that we do the same?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Heather, Cheryl here. Sorry, I'm actually on the road now and not in the audio as such. I'm on a mobile phone. I hope you don't mind me jumping in. I think that's very important. So I'm absolutely supportive of that. But I'd also suggest that we see whether or not a small time could be devoted for a formal update.

The GAC often in meetings nowadays does have little 10 and 15 minute slots for briefing by external organizational leagues, at least if not the committees as a whole. And it might be a good time to just remind them again what we're doing on this rather than just the pack smaller group that is already engaged in their country and territory name work.

And that would need to be done sort of fairly soon in the planning stage for both groups because it might be that the co-chairs might have to announce, you know, to be available on a Sunday or something. So I just wanted to put that forward as I think it would be a useful thing as well. Thanks.

Heather Dryden: Cheryl, I think that's an excellent idea. And I think we carry that right across the community, and not just provide an update for the GAC to the extent that we can fit onto for example the GNSO's working session updates on the weekend. The CCNO provide a formal update for the CCNSO and indeed provide a formal update to the ALAC as well. That's something that the co-chairs can work with staff - with (Bart) and Lars to see how we get on those agendas. I think that's an excellent idea - excellent idea.

Marvelous. Well with that in mind we have two minutes. We've finished on time. (Anna Beth)'s final comment here. We've got a few more comments in the Chat coming through. If anyone has any comments they would like to make verbally, I don't see any hands raised.

If we are happy with where we are, then perhaps what we do is we leave things here. We've noted our next meeting. And thank you very much to (Natalie) and Lars for confirming that. We'll leave you to circulate the details and confirm the time since we know we have some changing time zones with daylight savings and this sort of thing.

I thank everyone for their contribution. I think we're getting into the meat of the work, and it's very helpful. It is difficult to draft on the fly. So we'll put our heads down and we'll put things into writing. And we'll circulate that in a good timely manner before our next meeting so that we can have an equally robust discussion on the next time.

In the meantime should you have any comments that you'd like to submit in writing as we go ahead and work through the document, then please do that - always welcome.

Thank you everyone. Thank you very much. Everyone have a lovely day. For those of here on the side of the time zone, we're just starting our day. And for those of you going to bed, have a good sleep. Thanks very much everyone. Bye now.

Group: Thanks Heather.

Group: Bye.

                          END