Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Country/Territory Names as TLDs
TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, 26 November 2014 at 0900 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-20141126-en.mp3
On page: http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#nov

Attendees:

ccNSO
Ron Sherwood, .vi
Mirjana Tasic, .rs
Laura Hutchison, .uk
Annebeth Lange, .no
Grigori Saghyan, .am
Neil El Himam, .id
Annebeth Lange, .no

GNSO
Heather Forrest, IPC (Co-Chair)
Maxim Alzoba, NTAG
Liz Williams, NTAG
Sonigitu Ekpe, NCUC
Carlos Raul Guttierez, NPOC

SSAC
Jaap Akkerhuis

At-Large
Cheryl Langdon-Orr

Apologies:
Carlos Marco Liuzzi
Jordi Iparraguirre, ccNSO Council NomCom appointee
Young-Eum Lee, .kr
Gabriela Szlak, GNSO Council liaison
Mason Cole, RySG

<u>ICANN staff:</u>
Marika Konings
Bart Boswinkel
Lars Hoffman
Kristina Nordstrom
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much, (Francesca). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the CWG on Country and Territory Names as TLDs meeting on the 26th of November, 2014.

On the call today we have Grigori Saghyan, Liz Williams, Carlos Marco Liuzzi, Ron Sherwood, Neil Himam, Annebeth Lange, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Heather Forrest, Mirjana Tasic and Jaap Akkerhuis.

We have apologies from Jordi Iparraguirre, Young-Eum Lee, Gabriella Szlak, Carlos Marco Luizzi and Mason Cole.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Bart Boswinkel, Lars Hoffman, Kristina Nordstrom and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you ever so much and over to you, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thank you very much, Nathalie. And that deals with Item 1 in our agenda which is welcome and roll call save for one thing that I would like to add to this is to welcome and acknowledge our new GNSO co chair, Carlos Raul Gutierrez who joins us at the despicable hour of 3:00 am in Costa Rica. Carlos is, in addition to serving as co chair, representing the GNSO along with me a newly appointed member of the GNSO Council and Carlos will serve as our liaison to the GNSO Council. So, Carlos, perhaps if you're awake you might like to say hello.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes, this is Carlos. I'm testing the mic. Thank you very much. Good morning to everybody.

Heather Forrest: Marvelous. With that we have a relatively full agenda and the first item is, although I notice Ron's comment - Ron, you say there's no audio where you are. Are you not able to hear us? Nathalie is typing. Good. Thank you, Nathalie. Ron, Nathalie will follow up with you.

Item number 2 on our agenda is actions arising from our face to face meeting. Bart, you were very helpful in our face to face meeting which was in LA, in capturing those. Would you mind reminding us of what those are please?

Bart Boswinkel: I haven't - I haven't look through them. My apologies. The main one was organizing these calls, that's my recollection. But - and the other one - no these were the main ones and, say, going over for the work plan again today which is on the agenda.

Heather Forrest: Good, that's...

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: ...but I wanted a backup.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Heather Forrest: Very good. So we...

Bart Boswinkel: I will check and send them again, yeah. Heather, I will check again and send them to the list.

Heather Forrest: Marvelous. Thank you, Bart. With that I recall that I had in my own notes that establishing a meeting or subsequent meeting and then working on ideas as to the work plan which we largely were unable to talk to I believe we had maybe 10 or 15 minutes in LA, maximum, due to the fact that our discussion

largely centered around the GAC proposal that we really did not begin to discuss the work plan.

What we did say we would walk away and do as actions were to think about the feasibility of the timelines that Bart proposed in - or that Bart offered to the group in LA which was the feasibility of working towards a decision - how's this for tongue twister - as to feasibility of a - of a work plan up to Singapore and whether we understood that we could come up with a - make a decision, let's say, as to whether a framework on country and territory names would be achievable by Singapore, not to clarify, not the framework itself but simply the feasibility of the (unintelligible). I apologize, that's a jumble of words and I haven't done a very good job of explaining it.

But I think that all should be revealed in this call in the sense that we'll be speaking to that precise point.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, Number 4. That's Agenda Point 4 has a - that's why it's included anyway.

Heather Forrest: Yeah. Yeah. With that in mind, unless there are questions, which I'm sure there are given my very bad explanation of Point 2, although I put them off to Point 4 if I may, I'd like to progress to Point 3. And I suppose it's a useful thing in a sense that I lead the discussion on this point.

One thing that I suggested coming out of LA was that we had a very unique opportunity. I was struck and Annebeth and I spoke - I suppose in our roles as co chairs after the - after the LA face to face and said it was somewhat remarkable that the GAC was reaching out to the community before laying its words down in a communiqué and then the community races to catch up and doesn't really have an opportunity to comment.

I'm specifically referring to the subgroup of the GAC working group on future new gTLD rounds and the proposal that this subgroup has prepared or that

members of the subgroup have prepared, a proposal dealing with geographic names.

And it was quite clear in the session led by the GAC subgroup in LA and then by our meeting in LA that the scope of the work being undertaken by the subgroups within GAC in this proposal is significantly broader than our scope which follows on from the work done in the study group and is specifically limited to country and territory names.

And indeed that is our discussion in Point 4 of the agenda which is what are country and territory names and how do we harness them? How do we logically know what these names are such that we might then look to make recommendations on how those might be dealt with.

In addition the GAC proposal is significantly broader in scope in that it's - it is not limited to top level as we are. And this has engendered a fair amount of confusion in - within the working group and we had a fair robust discussion on this in LA and it has engendered a fair bit of questioning within the GAC.

Certain GAC members, or a number of GAC members, reached out to members of our working group, myself included and Annebeth, I think yourself included, Bart, to staff to say we don't understand why is this GAC effort happening at the same time that we have a cross community working group. Why are the two mandates so different or the two scopes so different? Why are they working on seemingly different timelines? What is happening?

And with that in mind, and that confusion, let's say, sparked the GAC, GAC members more broadly, to extend the comment deadline on the GAC subgroup proposal. Initially it was announced in LA that the comment period, if you like not necessarily a formal comment period but comment period would end two weeks after LA.

It was then proposed that it be extended into December and we've now landed with the end of the year so 31 December in terms of when the community is able to make feedback to the GAC on this proposal.

The idea behind this, as I understand it, is that there are members of the GAC who are, as I say, quite confused. And hoping to use this sort of a process as an experiment in seeking and actioning community feedback, community input, as I say, before GAC advice is hammered down in a communiqué and the community is left resisting that advice or questioning that advice or disputing that advice.

This is a rare opportunity that we have. And with that in mind I was delighted that we had the presentation that we did in our meeting albeit I suppose that encompassed the meeting; it took up the bulk of the meeting. But I think that was a necessary discussion to have so that we fully understood what the GAC was doing.

And it leaves us with an opportunity to speak to what we're doing, this comment period. So I approached Annebeth as a co chair and now Carlos who's recently joined us and staff and said from a procedural point of view is it possible, given that cross community working groups are new, is it possible that some of the things that were said within our face to face meeting by our members, could those things be captured in a comment and thereby, I mean, they're already in our transcript from that meeting.

But it would add a robustness to the GAC comment period, to our own work to the extent that we said look, we exist, we acknowledge that these confusions exist or for us an opportunity to clarify the scope of our working group and to formally commit to being involved in the process in a broader discussion that's happening within ICANN about this issue that is of interest to so many different constituencies and stakeholder groups.

And so I propose this as an idea. We talked about it at great length procedurally how this might happen. And to be - to the extent that we want to discuss any of the procedural questions I very happily turn it over to Bart and Marika and Lars who have navigated the pathways to how this could be done. And we've prepared a draft comment which essentially summarizes the discussions that we had in LA and specifically going to three points.

Number one, noting that our cross community working group exists and who the members are, not necessarily individuals but the fact that we draw from a broad representation of the community; two, noting the scope of our group and what our work is quite limited to; and, three, raising questions - I won't say concerns but identifying the very much broader scope of the GAC proposal and the fact that this is running at the same time as our work and questioning whether that is the best approach, let's say.

With that in mind I wouldn't mind, given that we've had so much discussion about it prior to this call, that Bart or Marika or Lars, that you'd comment procedurally on what it is that we're attempting to do here.

Bart Boswinkel: So this is Bart. I'll have a go at it and say for the details and other things I think Marika is best positioned to add to it. I can only add - inform you around the ccNSO point of view.

So the starting point is, as you said, Heather, this is a cross community working group. And if you look at the charter itself in principle this working group reports to the chartering organizations, that is the ccNSO and the GNSO so that's the starting point.

And, say, submitting a comment like say what you suggested is in principle, again and I'm talking high level principle here, is in principle out of scope of this working group.

But fortunately, excuse me because I have a cold. Fortunately, say, there is a provision in the charter that the co chairs of the working group in case they note something that is out of scope, can get back to the councils, the chartering organization so the ccNSO and GNSO Council, and propose a solution, a way of dealing with it. So that's the high level overview.

If you go, for example, through this (unintelligible) it would mean, and that's what Marika, Lars and I have been discussing, the easiest way forward would probably be that the co chairs on behalf of the working group, would go back to the chartering organizations and ask - and request they submit this letter, in principle, whether there is an objection or no objection from the councils of the chartering organization to submit this letter on behalf of the CWG itself.

So it will be a submission only on behalf of the CWG which also means that say others, either constituencies or individual ccTLDs or individual gTLDs, could subscribe and express support of the letter itself. I think that is the easiest way to explain how the working group could submit its own letter to - into the GAC process.

Marika, any additions or Lars?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think Bart did a great job of explaining that. Just maybe to add as well that of course the joint letter or the letter submitted by the CWG wouldn't prevent the GNSO Council and the ccNSO Council should they desire so to either send their own submissions or at, you know, a later stage, formally endorse or adopt the submission of the CWG.

But I think as, you know, especially from a GNSO side more time may be required to have a formal adoption by the Council taking into account the timeline that indeed the easiest path forward would be indeed to ask for non objection to the submission of this letter on behalf of the CWG.

So I think that's indeed what we're suggesting here. But of course that would first require that all of you on the call and as well in the group are of course okay with the contents of the letter which now is up on the Adobe Connect screen and I presume will be circulated shortly after this meeting so everyone has a chance to review that.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah and also with the process of course.

Heather Forrest: Thank you very much Bart and Marika. Indeed those were very good summaries of rather complicated questions. And I suppose I'll add to this to say that we are aware that there are constituencies within the GNSO that have already separately submitted comments to the proposal. And that reinforces the notion that nothing that's done here would impact upon other groups doing their own thing, endorsing our comments or anything of the sort.

The object here, again, to clarify, the object here is to take an opportunity to work within a very new - a very new GAC process. And I suppose what we're doing also responds to Bart's comment that they see it envisioned in the scope of what the cross constituency working group is doing and I think that's explainable by two things, number one, cross constituency working groups of this fashion are relatively new and we're finding our feet within ICANN and this is an initiative to involve the community in a more robust way.

And, likewise, this process that the GAC is doing is a very new thing. This is indeed the first time that the GAC has done something like this. So I'm not at all deterred by the fact that this is not envisioned within our charter because indeed it's not really envisioned within ICANN process that this would necessarily happen. So that doesn't, in my mind, doesn't raise any flags.

What I would like to do is to invite Annebeth to make comments. I'll say that this draft, what you see and what was circulate - it has my full support. That's me speaking for me; that's not me speaking for the group in any way, shape or form or from my constituency or for the GNSO. But I would like to turn to

Annebeth so that she can make some comments. Annebeth, have you lost audio? No, Annebeth, we cannot hear you.

Annebeth Lange: Can you hear me now?

Heather Forrest: Yes, Annebeth, we can hear you. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Okay. Hello, this is Annebeth. Yes, I can also acknowledge this letter as focusing on the main points now. And the main point is to make the GAC aware that part of their scope or their mandate is going into what we are doing. And it will not be a good solution if they come to an answer or decide what to do with country and territory names before we have finished the work in other group. That's the main objection from my point of view.

So this letter I think puts down the things that all the cross community can agree on. And then perhaps its differences and nuances from the different constituency afterwards. But that will be up to them. But I can stand behind this letter as just like you, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Annebeth. And I understand that separately, entirely independently of this process, that the ccNSO has been working on its own draft so this follows up on my comment the GNSO constituencies have been working on comments. And Annebeth, not asking you to disclose the contents of that but can you confirm that that is indeed the case that the ccNSO has been looking at this issue closely?

Annebeth Lange: This is Annebeth again. Yes, it is. So the ccNSO has made a draft and this is - as I understand it, Bart, it's acknowledged by the ccNSO Council and it's ready to go out if you choose to do so, if the ccNSO choose to do so.

And it's - that letter also capture the things that in this draft even if it goes a little further into the work that was done in the study group, more details perhaps. But it's not very different to be honest.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Annebeth. What I would like now to turn our discussion to, this gives you an understanding of what the motivation has been and what we've looked at procedurally. The first procedural step in this process really needs to be within this group so leaving aside what Bart and Marika have said about GNSO and ccNSO procedures.

You - we've really only just finished the draft having grappled with procedure issues for a fair while. And you do have it on the screen in front of you what I think would be useful is to focus on our own internal process. And what I - let's say what I propose is that in - we discuss as a first port of discussion whether we as a group agree with the concept of submitting a comment to the GAC working group and then we discuss the content of the letter.

And I don't anticipate that we'll have much of a substantive discussion now given that the letter has only just been put up. But if we could discuss the concept of submitting a comment I think that would be very fruitful. So if anyone would like to - would like to address the idea or the concept as to whether we as a group contribute to this GAC process it would be marvelous to hear now. And I...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Cheryl acknowledges.

Heather Forrest: Cheryl, are you - would you like to speak on this point? No, it's not a hand up. I don't see any hands up.

Bart Boswinkel: No, it's more an acknowledgement.

Heather Forrest: Very good. Very good. Annebeth.

Bart Boswinkel: And Annebeth...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, Cheryl here...

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: Yeah, hello again. It's Annebeth. Just wanted to point out that if we can do something together this is the first time we have had an opportunity to do that in the GAC, as to Heather said, and which of use that opportunity. And if we will - if we really can agree on the points or the main point in this letter it will strengthen the calls that we can do our work and not be taken - that the result will be taken in advance by the GAC.

Bart Boswinkel: Say, Sonigitu has agreed as well with the process. Maxim is, again, to ask the subgroup - the GAC subgroup to take our letter into consideration. And others are typing as well so. Laura, I don't see - have a mic to (unintelligible) but just wanted to say that I would be supportive of submitting a letter. I agree with Annebeth's point that it is important that we make the GAC aware of the overlap so that they do not reach recommendations before we conclude our work.

Maxim is typing.

Heather Forrest: We have several comments in support. It would be helpful if anyone - and please feel free to do so - if anyone is uncomfortable with the approach please by all means voice those concerns now. Maxim, you make an excellent point in the comment. This is Heather. That we might add wording that we would be happy to provide further clarifications and happy to have face to face meetings as required.

We have said at the end of the letter we hope the comment marks the beginning of a fruitful working relationship between our respective groups and remain at your disposal for questions or clarifying follow ups.

I agree and I think one thing that we could do is invite the entire GAC working group, not just the subgroup, to our meeting in Singapore. And perhaps that's something that could be inserted into the letter.

Bart Boswinkel: Support from Cheryl for your suggestion, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Marvelous. Marvelous. Annebeth as well. Maxim as well. And Lars, we'll wait for your comments. Marvelous. That would be good. Lars's comments, "Happy to circulate a new draft later today." I think that would be very helpful. Any comments that we make today - what we'll do is those can go into the draft, Lars, if you're willing and that way the draft that gets circulated is the most up to date. And Maxim - we'll wait for your comments.

Be ready for their suggestion to meet before Sunday. It's a very interesting point and how we spend our time - I'm increasingly disgruntled, I suppose, or frustrated by the fact that we have this 8:00 am time slot on a day that comes after, if there is a gala, the gala. And that we only have an hour. And this is not ideal in terms of getting work done. And here we are trying to work on a framework and deal with substantive issues.

Bart, Marika, is there any hope of getting more than an hour and on a day when others might be able to participate? Or could we even try and do a joint session? I realize I might be suggesting heresy here but a joint session of the GAC subgroup and our group.

Bart Boswinkel: Heather, this is Bart. Say, my understanding is, say, a longer session is not really an issue. The day may be an issue especially knowing that, say, a lot of you will be attending the, say, or are involved and engaged with the GNSO Council meetings on Saturday and Sunday.

And a lot of CC members do not arrive until Sunday or Monday. So and Tuesday and Wednesdays are out in the sense Tuesday is Constituency

Day; Wednesday is again an additional day for the ccNSO members where they have meetings. So what's only that is effectively Monday and Thursday.

Now Thursday afternoon - also Monday afternoon at the end of the day there is the joint ccNSO GNSO Council meeting. So we could try for Monday afternoon or again Thursday morning. But I think the 1.5 - we can extend it to 1.5 or 2 hours if that's the - if that's what the group wants.

And maybe, yeah, the Monday afternoon is given the intention to invite GAC members as well. Might not be too bad. But at the same time these are the, say, Monday afternoon is where there will be a lot of activities, my guess, around the accountability and stewardship transition process which will be quite heavy competition for the working group.

Heather Forrest: Understood, Bart. Thank you. From a GNSO perspective Monday has significant advantages in that, you know, much of the real work in the week, substance in the week that's not dealt with in a GNSO Council meeting is done on Tuesday and so to the extent that we were able to meet before Tuesday that would expedite our work.

I think we'll see benefits in terms of what we have sign off official or unofficial. We'll get things into the pipeline much sooner if we were able to meet before Tuesday. And I think, frankly, it's Thursday - by Thursday we're all tired and the business of the week is largely done. And in order to be on the agenda for the week I think we need to be earlier in the week.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. So let's aim for, say, let's aim for Monday afternoon before the joint Council meeting because that's a great opportunity, again, to update the councils, again, as we did in LA.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. I fully support that. And I'd also be greedy and ask for a 90-minute meeting if we could do.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, so let's get - say, see what we can do as staff for Monday afternoon. But be aware, say, there might be issues with some, say, main sessions in the main hall which might attract a lot of people like on the accountability and stewardship process.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. Understood. I do think as our group gains traction and gains the number of - or increases in the number of participants in the room that we might become a main attraction so.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Heather Forrest: All right, any objections then to attempting to schedule a 90-minute meeting on Monday? A few comments. And Cheryl, I think that's a - it's a very good point; potentially we work on the lunch break. Perhaps we could have a working lunch.

We have Maxim and Laura contributing comments on the - good, yeah, lunch breaks usually can (unintelligible). Bart and Marika and Lars, we leave this one in your super capable hands. With - thank you, Laura, for your comment on the list, no objections.

Let's then turn to substance. What I propose is that we do have the addition of the - and perhaps Lars, in light of this, we'd be a little bit flexible in terms of how we update the draft. I suppose we just be open and say we'd like to invite you to our face to face meeting in Singapore which we're currently working on scheduling at a time when we think the GAC might be available, would be flexible in how we put that language.

I wouldn't want us to commit right now to a Monday afternoon meeting but I also wouldn't want to hold up circulating the draft until we can confirm our meeting time because if that's the case we might well be a long way.

From a procedural next step point of view so we have no objection within the group articulated here for the concept of making a comment and in fact quite strong support for making a comment.

The next thing is the substance. So what I propose that we do is we'll have the draft circulated, Lars, if you're happy to do that at the end of our call after you've had a chance to make any updates.

And then please, I suppose the best thing to do would be to post your comments, if you have comments, if you have concerns, we can post them around by email. And to the extent that we want to have another call we could try and do that.

The timing here is a challenge. And now we come to the third step in this which is when this leaves us and seeks the non objections of the GNSO Council and ccNSO Council. And in order to do that and have this on the agenda within both supporting organizations, we really need to have comments by the 1st of December if we can do which is a day shy of a week out.

I'm conscious that that's a quick turnaround time and I'm conscious that that's not always easy to do. But to the extent that we want this to happen we need to get it on the agendas in the ccNSO and the GNSO so if you are able to make your comments then it would be marvelous to have those by the 1st.

And I suppose if we have - if we have some sort of a round robin email on the 1st just to catch up to make sure that we have everyone's comments or that the response may be I'm working on a comment but pardon me, I haven't had the chance to email it yet, then at least we have, pardon me, visibility that we could perhaps go to the GNSO or the ccNSO and say please put this on the agenda and please spare us one day to deliver the draft to you or deliver the letter to you.

And we'll need to - we'll need to agree on the draft as well. So in addition to comments we need to have agreement by the group. Are we able to handle that by email or do we need another call to do that? Any thoughts? Comments?

Cheryl says, "Email - is this achievable by email?" I think it is. We've really managed much of the drafting of this - of the draft letter by email. Carlos is up to email. Neil's comments, email excellent. Marvelous. So let's do that then. Lars, we leave it in your capable hands to circulate the draft and we'll - when you make comments please make comments to the whole group to save us time. We're all on different time zones and that way we can respond as soon as possible. And we'll look to have a sweep up of things by the 1st if at all possible.

And Marika, just to confirm because it's really the GNSO's timetable for submission that is driving the 1st. Will that be good if we get this in by midnight on the 1st? Will that suffice?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think the official timeline is 2359 UTC so that should work. But I'll confirm that.

Heather Forrest: Marvelous. And what we might just do is foreshadow this to Glen that the paper is coming. Excellent.

Bart Boswinkel: Heather just - just - Heather, this is Bart.

Heather Forrest: Yes, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Just a final step, say, in order for the recalling, I suppose that, say, the four of you, so that's Annebeth, Paul, Carlos and yourself, will submit the request to the councils on behalf of the group. So that's on the - by the 1st of December or earlier than - if achievable.

Heather Forrest: Understood, Bart. Understood. And given that we're the signatories of the letter it seems that that's the most appropriate thing to do.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. And the second point, and maybe that's something, but that's more for discussion right now, say, around the letter itself that the intention of this letter was that it's more on a high level process procedural and not going into the details of - in order to allow both the ccTLD, or the ccNSO, GNSO and others to support the letter so not go into the details of the proposals themselves.

So if people have comments on the letter itself please have it on high level and do not, yeah, you could add additional points but keep in the back of your mind they need to be supported by all the chartering organizations.

Heather Forrest: Absolutely, Bart. I agree fully with what you said. That is indeed the reason for the high level in the comment. Now, Annebeth has asked a comment of your, Bart, or a question of you. "What is the deadline for the ccNSO?" So when do papers need to be submitted to the ccNSO for its December meeting?

Bart Boswinkel: It's - the ccNSO Council meeting is on the 11th of December. It needs to be on the agenda a week in advance so by the 4th. And we can submit papers up to two days before that so that's not the real issue. And if need be we can do it by an email vote as well.

So there's - as you said and as Marika said, say, the real, say, the critical path is with the GNSO Council in this case.

Heather Forrest: Excellent. Thank you, Bart. Are there any further questions then on Item 3 of the agenda? No hands up, no comments on the screen. So with that I will progress to Point 4.

Point 4 is following on from our face to face meeting in LA. And specifically deals with the work plan that was put forward outlining what we might achieve between what we then thought to be Marrakesh and is not Singapore. The first item on that is the face to face meeting in LA, which we've achieved.

The second item - marvelous, Bart, thank you. Bart's, I suspect, putting that up on the Adobe for us. The second item was this call that we're having now, the November conference call which as largely now been subsumed not by the first reading of the issues so much as it has by the response that we might make to the GAC. And I suppose it's really just a timing issue that this is an opportunity and we've seized it and therefore it's shifted our work plan a bit.

So, Bart, I suppose we might update the work plan a bit...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, I will.

Heather Forrest: ...and reflect the discussion that we've had today. And that then cascades down in terms of what we're able to achieve. First reading of the issues, and we're dealing now with the points that are set out in Point 5 of our agenda today.

And I wonder if we might deal with the procedural point first which is how we might communicate this discussion? How do we have this discussion? Because I don't think an hour call with the group is going to be sufficient.

So perhaps we talk to the procedure of the issues today and we do a first reading in December, a second reading of issues in January and then we begin in Marrakesh with any cleanup on the second reading and discuss the feasibility of a harmonized framework in - excuse me, I said Marrakesh - in Singapore. Does that sound like a sensible approach in terms of how we order our work? We still stay within the timeline that we had proposed but we shift things around at the end a bit.

And Annebeth, I note your comment that you need to leave in 5 minutes and you support that approach then so that those revisions to the work plan. Anyone not comfortable with those revisions to the work plan? Support from Carlos. Support from Cheryl and no non support. Thank you, everyone.

So then, Bart, may I - very good. Bart has an action and Bart is typing the action as we speak. Maxim, thank you, I note your comment there in support. So Bart, if you would be so kind as to circulate the updated work plan I think that would be very helpful.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, no problem at all.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Bart. Turning now to 5. And this is where - this is the pointy end of our discussion, I suppose. The study group identified a number of issues. And issues in this context is code for challenges and obstacles to our work, namely that these are very thorny issues. This is a topic that has disparate views involved in it. And, Carlos, what do we mean 5 under study group?

So this working group, the reason - the reason for being of this working group is that the ccNSO conducted a - or led - initiated a study group on the use of country and territory names at the top level. And that study group largely undertook its work in 2012-'13 and came to the view that a working group was necessary to flesh out these views further. It's a shame to summarize that group's work in such a blunt instrument but really that is the point that we are here because a study group recommended that we be here.

And the study group report identifies challenges to developing a standardized approach to country and territory names not least of which the challenges defining what is a country or territory name and where do we find that is that a moving target and how do we deal with the fact that country and territory names change and languages and these sorts of things.

Again, apologies, that's a very rough and ready summary of summary of the issues. And Annebeth has very rightfully pointed out that the link to the final report is in the agenda for this meeting.

What I propose that we focus on now in the time remaining in our meeting is to discuss how do we want to discuss these issues? This is nothing something I think that is easily done over an hour conference call. It may not also be something that's easily done by email. Is this something that - I suppose can turn to practicing in other working groups. Is this something that we can do over a wiki where we have threads of discussion?

Because there are a number of issues. And it'd be hard to keep track of who comments own that issue and what issue a particular comment relates to and how we record all this. And I do think there's an exercise in recording all of the comments that are made and disparate transcripts aren't ideal for that.

Bart, Marika, Lars, I turn to you, do you have suggestions as to how we might do this?

Bart Boswinkel: Different - say I think Marika and Lars, you should speak to the wiki. It's, say, what I know from the CC community the wiki is not used very often as a way of discussing items; it's used to record but that's it. Most of the times what you can see is - and this is, say, from one of the more contentious ccNSO topics - ccTLD topics that's the framework of interpretation.

If needed as you start creating email threads in the sense of using a Heather in the subject line focusing on a particular topic so people can jump in. But that's - the danger there is is you - if you really have a lot of emails you easily lose track. So that's difficult.

Wiki space maybe a combined one is a good one. Or just start - and maybe that's something for the co chairs is start fleshing out some of the different threads and come up with a kind of - and I think that's probably really worth

doing is come up with a document where you see the different issues. And it's not just to be, say, in that sense say you've got a very good overview of the landscape, Heather, together with Annebeth and Paul and Carlos where the issues are.

Just identify potential issues and maybe then assign issues to other group members and report back to the group. So there are various ways. But it's - the real issue will be to - not to lose track of what's happening; at least that is my experience. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. I think in the GNSO we typically use as well, you know, various approaches. As Bart said, I think, you know, same applies in the GNSO community, you know, some people really like using the wiki; others don't. So usually we do host like the information, any draft documents, on the wiki so there's a central place where people can go and find that information for those that want to comment there or provide information there they can do so there.

But alternatively as well you can start indeed email threats on topics on the mailing list and then staff can assist, for example, in pulling those comments into the wiki. So, again, there's a central place where all the information can be found.

And then it's a question indeed, and Bart already alluded to that as well where, you know, if we see that there are clear threads and maybe have, indeed, leads for those different threads to try to pull some of that together, and then eventually bring that all together in one type of document for the whole working group to review.

So I think there are various approaches and I think it just depends basically on what the group feels more - most comfortable with and indeed maybe it's something where the chairs can have a first look and, you know, make a

recommendation to the group as to what you believe may be the most effective way in moving this forward.

Heather Forrest: Carlos, I see your have your hand up.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes, just in terms of keeping track what's going on it's - I don't know how you would solve the fact that we have - on the one hand we have GAC's group; on the other hand we have precedence in terms of dotPatagonia, dotBrazil and on the third hand, if I may say, we have now the cross community working group.

It will be very difficult to keep everything separate and not prejudge any thread. So we have to think a little bit more about the different sides of the issue because it might get boggled down, you know.

I see in the GAC paper a lot of what we discussed over the last year on Patagonia and Amazon and so we have to be very careful when we start mixing our group with (unintelligible) opinions to the Board it's really - it's tricky. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Carlos. You very rightfully pointed out that not only is the substance difficult, the number - the shear number of players and the differences in their interests in this is difficult. I think we're going to find ourselves in the hurricane here soon.

And all the more reason to very clearly document our process and how we go about this discussion of issues. I - Marika, I take your point that this might be best - we think about this offline amongst the co chairs and how best we might go about this although I don't necessarily want to delay - I don't want to waste time - not to say that it's a waste of time - but I don't want to lose time thinking about how before we start doing because until we make this decision it will delay our substantive discussion.

Are we able to, by email, come to a view on this before the December meeting so that when we have our substantive discussion in December, I mean, ideally you'd like to see that this is implemented before the December call because otherwise we're not going to get anything done in the December call; we'll simply be having a fairly open-ended discussion.

Is this something that we can do, Carlos, I agree. Carlos says we should have it ready before the next call. Is this something that we can achieve by email as well? Your thoughts.

Bart Boswinkel: Heather, this is Bart. I definitely think we can do it by email and say if need be we can organize a call again with those co chairs who are available and maybe at this time at a more reasonable hour for you and Paul.

Heather Forrest: That would be very kind and very (unintelligible). I'm hopeful that we can do this by email. I think that that would be good and I'd like to see it up and running before December. And so then I suppose we'll keep in touch on that basis unless we hear or see objections between now and then, then we will - we'll put that on the action list for all of the co chairs and as staff to follow up on.

With that, I - let's say we'll close that topic in the agenda taking particular note of Items 5.1, 1.1 and 1.2 in the agenda. These are the substantive questions that we'll be dealing with. And once we find a way as to how to do that, how to document that, then please make a mental note now of those questions and begin to think about those. It's now just a matter of the format how we go about communicating views on this.

And Carlos, you make a very valid point: we need a common name. The GAC calls it protection; the GNSO calls it use; and I suppose we're driven by the scope of our - of our charter which uses - I can't now tell you the term. Bart, you might - Bart or Marika or Lars, you might help me here. Our formal name is the Working Group on Country and Territory Names. I don't know

that we use the word protection or use but it's something that we need to go back and look at in...

Bart Boswinkel: I'm sorry, I was on mute. It's - the formal name of the working group is On the Use of Names of Country and Territories as Top Level Domains.

Heather Forrest: Good. All right so then...

Bart Boswinkel: So that includes already the limit and scope - or the limitation of scope of the working group so it's only around top level domains and country and territory names.

Heather Forrest: Thank you for all - to Cheryl for your comment and Carlos. I agree that we need to have an understanding as to what use is and that that needs to be clear in our comments. And indeed, this could be an issue in and of itself what use is and the difference between these.

So, Bart, I might even add that to our 5.1 maybe a new - a new plus sign there, 5.1.2 is how we deal with this idea of use and exploring that. With that, and I see Bart adding that, thank you very much.

We can turn to - it's 9:00 in my time zone which means it's 4:00 am in Carlos's time zone and time up in all of our time zones. Turn to any other business, would anyone like to add anything further before we close our meeting?

Seeing no hands, no immediate barrage of chat then we have a very clear list of action items. I'm grateful to all of you for the robust chat that's happened in the chat room. I think we've covered a fair bit of what we needed to do. We're on track with our work plan in a sense and hopefully we can continue to be on track. And I'm grateful to everyone for their participation today so if there is nothing further I - Carlos, I see that you are typing. Carlos says "Gracias."

There we are. So with that and nothing further I wish you all a good morning, afternoon and evening and we shall talk again in December and in the meantime on email.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Thank you, Heather. Bye-bye, all.

Heather Forrest: Bye now.

Marika Konings: Thanks. Bye.

Man: Good bye, everybody.

((Crosstalk))

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Okay, bye-bye.

END