

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

Monday, 21 September 2015 at 20:00 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-ctn-21sep15-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#sep>

Attendees:

ccNSO:

Jordi Iparraguirre, ccNSO Council NomCom appointee
Mirjana Tasic, .rs
Laura Hutchison, .uk
Jacqueline Morris, .tt
Ron Sherwood .vi
Joke Braeken, .eu
Annebeth Lange, .no
Mary Uduma, .ng
Paul Szyndler (co-Chair), .au

GNSO

Heather Forrest, IPC (Co-Chair)
Maxim Alzoba, NTAG
Colin O'Brien, IPC

At-Large:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr

GAC:

Olga Cavalli, GAC

ISO:

Jaap Akkerhuis

Other:

Apologies:

Carlos Raul Gutierrez, NPOC (co-Chair)
Sanna Sahlman, .fi

ICANN staff:
Marika Konings
Karine Perset
Bart Boswinkel
Nathalie Peregrine
Terri Agnew

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the CWG on Country and Territory Means as TLBs on the 21 of September, 2015. On the call today, we have Mary Uduma, Heather Forrest, Maxim Alzoba, Annebeth Lange, Ron Sherwood, Paul Szyndler, Mirjana Tasic, Karine Perset, Laura Hutchison, Joke Braeken, Jaap Akkerhuis, Collin O'Brien, Jordi Iparraguirre, Olga Cavalli, and Cheryl Langdon-Orr will be joining us in a moment.

We have apologies from Carlos Raul Gutierrez and Sanna Sahlman. From staff, we have Nathalie Peregrine, Bart Boswinkel, and myself, Terri Agnew, as well as Marika Koning. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And it looks like Jacqueline Morris has just joined us as well.

I'll now turn it back over to Annebeth.

(Annebeth Lange): Thank you very much. Since (unintelligible) Carlos are not able to attend and (Paul) and Heather is - they are on a plane that's very early in the morning, I will try to lead you through today's call. And it's very nice that so many people have joined us on the different hours around the world.

So we start with the agenda and go through the point 1 with the - and start the review of the Strawman Paper. That is the options paper and the directions you have been sent, I think it's the version of 18 of September. But on the screen, you will see a version 21 of September.

That part has added some extra material and - in that one so we come to that in a minute. And as he wrote in the mail when he sent it out, the major changes for the last time we discussed the options paper are the following. There is a new text on the role of the ISO 3168 for post by (Jap) which can be found on page 6 in the document.

We have suggestion as discussed previously to turn the conditions section into a glossary that will evolve over time. And then it's just several areas that need to be completed now regarding the two-letter codes. And as for these two-letter codes, these have been discussed earlier and we have reached a preliminary recommendation based on the different options presented earlier.

And though the text is included here in the Strawman Paper showed on the screen. And then - they'll be sent out after the call. So, Bart could you please go through this and elaborate it a little?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes I will. I'll - let me - to the - on the same side, I'll scroll through it. I hope you all can see it. I can increase the size a little bit - see if that is any better.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Sorry, just to let you know, I have no internet so I can't join the Adobe Connect room. I am...

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

Woman: ...without all communication other than the phone which is very distracting, so I apologize.

Bart Boswinkel: Oh, dear.

(Annebeth Lange): Sorry about that.

Bart Boswinkel: Now, to be fair and to be on the safe side, please note there are - there is one major different between the 18 September and the 8 of August version. The 8 of August version use the old - how should I say it - the old structure of the Strawman paper.

And, say, what I've been using for the 18 of September one was the adjusted structure as discussed. So there are major - so that's why you see, say, the formative years and you can see it in the title of the headings. So you can see it in the formative years, etcetera.

In this version, the major changes are marked yellow in order to avoid the - how should I call - the track changes - because there were too many and I say - I assume they were all adopted. So the major changes now, in, say, the note regarding to the formative years and the introductory, this was a comment as that, say, the overview is not intended to be a complete history of what happened.

It's only related to what is the working group considered relevant with regard to the use of country and territory names. So moving forward, I'm going to Page 6 now, and this is where you can see the major difference. In - as far as I understood, the working group agreed to use a special section in the - or to start including text ring sections where there would be an opportunity to explain clearly - for example - what is the role in this case - what is the role of the ISO 3166 maintenance agency and without putting it in the main text of the Strawman itself.

So, for the record, it's a very factual language and it doesn't fit into the flow of the text itself. So - and it's also to highlight the relevant section itself. So (Jap), as he's the ICANN-appointed member on the ISO 3166 maintenance agency, has kindly - developed the language that you see here now. It took some time, but, say, in this version, it's included.

Take your time to read it. If you have any questions, please send it to the list and we'll use - we collect all the questions, etcetera, to run it through, say, on the next meeting. So this is the language on how new entries are included in the ISO 3166 standard, as a starting point, and how the maintenance - and a little bit on the role the maintenance agency and, say, the guidelines they've been using and to provide guidance to it.

So because this is an area of a lot of - which is not very well-known, say, we agreed to include this part in the options paper and in the historical overview so the reader will have an understanding what it means. So that's the section that is marked now yellow. Moving forward, there are still some areas that need to be included.

And (Lars) and I agreed to try to work on this and update this in the, say, for the next version. So that's for the next end - before the next call. And we need to align this, again, with the 8 of August Strawman.

Update the (NSA) -- it's now included. And let me move forward to what - (Anna Beth) was alluding to that is a bit on methodology - oh yes. This is definitions; it now will be called glossary. Probably, it has to be moved out and try to put it at the end or at the starting of the document.

As you may recall, during the BA meeting, when we had the face-to-face meeting, we had an extensive discussion on whether or not to develop definitions. And it was, as (Anna Beth) said, an agreed by the working group that the, say, this would turn into a glossary and that would evolve over time in parallel with the text of the Strawman and the decisions of the working group.

So moving forward, this is what you see reflected here. Moving forward, the framework needs to be updated and what is now included is the section on - let me scroll down - discussion section on the two-letter codes and the

preliminary recommendations on the two-letter codes. And that was included in the 8 of August version.

And then we move on to - Annex A is what was originally in the text on the recommendations of the - I think it was called the reserve names group of the new gTLD process. These are the major changes. So going back to you - handing over - back over to you, (Anna Beth).

(Annebeth Lange): Thank you, Bart. That made it some clearer. So if you, in the working group, have some comments or questions to any of this, it will be great to either have it now or in writing to the list so we can try to do it even better for the next telephone call we're going to have before we meet in Dublin.

So any questions before we go on to the next issue on the agenda?

Bart Boswinkel: (Anna Beth)...

(Annebeth Lange): Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: ...Heather has her hand up.

(Annebeth Lange): Okay. Yes, okay, Heather. It's difficult to see you but please help me...

Heather Forrest: Good morning, (Anna Beth).

(Annebeth Lange): Yes, good morning, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thank you very much - don't be silly. So it - one quick comment I would like to read through the amendments in detail. So I won't give any detailed comments at this point, but I would suggest that what we do - I'm conscious that this document will be used by others after us - long after our CWG is done with its work and we go back to doing whatever it is that we do.

Albeit, that seems like a very long way away. There will be a time when we are not together as a group. And with that in mind, I think the information that (YAP) has suggested is very, very helpful.

I would like to some way in the document to attribute either the source of the information or how this information came to be gathered even if it doesn't name a particular individual. I think that's fine, it's just that It would be nice for others to pick up this document further down to be able to say, you know, this information came from a reliable source and here's how this information was generated. Thank you.

(Annebeth Lange): Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I...

(Annebeth Lange): Thank you, Heather. I totally agree on that and it's very important to get in the report what is really fact and what we have discussed and what we are at fault. That's something else. So Yap has been doing a very good job for us and it's very helpful to make everybody understand what's the background of what we're discussing.

So thank you Yap and I totally agree with you, Heather. Anybody else have any comments. It's very difficult to see who's raising their hand so it's hard to scroll here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Anna Beth), I haven't got my hand in because I'm not there, but I just wanted to agree with (Heather's) comment and your support on the attributions, particularly, from expertise like (Jap).

(Annebeth Lange): Yes, absolutely. Thank you, Cheryl. Thank you. So okay, if you go on to the next issue on the agenda, that is the status of the questionnaires or the requests for input on three-letter codes, which is the area we're trying to find a solution for at the moment.

So it has been presented with the different options we have talked about and all specific questions. What we do know about the status is that Heather and Carlos - please correct me, Heather, if I'm saying something wrong here - the co-chairs for the GNSO in the working group have sent it to the council, which, again, has forwarded it to the different stakeholder groups in the GNSO community.

There will be no answer directly from the council, but hopefully reactions from several stakeholder groups. And is this correct, Heather?

Heather Forrest: It is, (Anna Beth); 100%.

(Annebeth Lange): Good. As for this - in (GGNSO), the council will receive a written explanation from (unintelligible) on the issue in addition to the request that has been sent to the chair (Byron Holland) so that the council is prepared for the discussions in Dublin. (Unintelligible) and I will present the issue and run through the survey on the members meeting on Tuesday in Dublin (unintelligible) the levers to engage.

So as for the GAC, Olga, perhaps you can enlighten us a little. But what I have heard is that (Thomas Nigel) -- the GAC chair -- has received the request, but I haven't heard anything about reactions. Do you know if the members of the GAC have been asked to give some comments?

Olga Cavalli: I think that (Thomas) has received the information...

(Annebeth Lange): Olga, can you hear me?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I can hear you. Can you hear me?

(Annebeth Lange): I hear you.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, I can hear you but not very well. I think that you're asking about the (fitter) codes that you sent a questionnaire. Is that the question?

(Annebeth Lange): Yes. Yes, it is.

Olga Cavalli: Well, I received - yes, I haven't seen it circulated in the GAC list so far, but maybe I can check with (Thomas) and with the GAC. I am not sure. Do you know when she said?

(Annebeth Lange): Yes. That - (Don), you there? You have sent it to all the chairs of the SOs and ACs haven't you? (Don)?

Bart Boswinkel: I think we're missing him today, (Anna Beth).

Man: Yes, Lars is not on the call.

(Annebeth Lange): Okay, okay.

Man: He's in transit.

(Annebeth Lange): Oh, he's not. Okay. I think he has done that.

Man: Yes, it was - (Anna Beth). (Anna Beth).

(Annebeth Lange): I think he has sent it to all the - yes. Yes.

Man: It was sent on the same date as to all the others to, like, for example, (Byron), I think.

(Annebeth Lange): Yes, yes.

Man: So that was early September.

(Annebeth Lange): Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Then it's...

Woman: Can I confirm ALAC has got it. And in fact, ALAC has assigned a pin holder to the age-specific region to work with me and the questions have gone out or are about to go out - we've got a Wiki page for comments to come in. But you will be getting a response from the ALAC.

And in fact, (Maureen), who's going to be pin-holder on this for us, has recently sent me a draft e-mail to go to all of our regional leaderships and all of the At-Large structures with, say, a sort of a sanitized info question version of the questions and linking them back to the page. So hopefully, we'll get some decent feedback there as well.

And when I leave the property and get some 3G so I can at least use my mobile phone to connect to the internet, I'll be approving that for (Maureen) to send out later today. Thanks.

(Annebeth Lange): Thank you, (unintelligible) (Anna Beth) again. And I see that (Jap) has noted in the chat that the (FAC) have got the e-mail as well. If members from the stakeholder groups...

Olga Cavalli: (Anna Beth)?

(Annebeth Lange): Yes, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Would you be so kind to resend the e-mail to me because I don't have it in my inbox and...

(Annebeth Lange): Yes, yes.

Olga Cavalli: ...there are many, many other...

(Annebeth Lange): I'll make sure that you get.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, sure.

(Annebeth Lange): We will make sure that you get it directly.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much.

(Annebeth Lange): Okay, yes. And so we are trying to find a way to work to include the community to ask for their guidance on these sensitive questions - at least to check pulse out there. However, what we realize is that in the cross-community working group, we have the extra problem with the different communities having different ways of working.

And this will inevitably set the pace. So this actually means that we will not have interest from all communities until after Dublin at the best. So before we proceed with the next issue on the agenda, Olga, you have raised a question on the email list...

Bart Boswinkel: (Anna Beth), (Anna Beth).

(Annebeth Lange): Yes, yes, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: I think there are two hands up relating to - before we move on to the next topic.

(Annebeth Lange): Oh, I'm - good, good, good. I'm so happy that you tell me that. It's so difficult to follow it. (Jap).

Bart Boswinkel: The first person is (Jap) - yes

(Annebeth Lange): Yes, and then it's (Corrine).

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

(Jap): Excuse me.

(Annebeth Lange): Hi, (Jap).

(Jap): Hi. There was a - an (ESSAC) meeting last week and I - where actually came on the agenda. And I explained to (Beth) of it and everyone else there - anyway, the plan is that we won't be as direct answer to the questions, but there will be an official GAC - stating that (ESSAC) is following the description and it's fairly - interesting about what comes out of it and operate and happy to give advice.

(Annebeth Lange): Okay, thank you very much. (Corrine).

(Corrine): Yes, hello and I just wanted to say that the GAC has not yet received the paper but the GAC chair did and was going to raise it with the vice-chairs, but other things happened. But it should be - it should take place very soon -- the GAC should receive it.

(Annebeth Lange): Thank you very much. Yes, thank you very much (Corrine). It's (Anna Beth) here. And Olga, should I just ask you about the e-mail you sent to the list today when you refer to something that should have been sent to the (LAC) RALO list - email list - since Carlos is not attending this call?

And don't actually know what Carlos has to say about this -- only that, what he has said is that he has given some background on the working group and the corporation between the working group and the GAC and sorting out the different but somewhat coinciding scopes. So in the letter from the GNSO

and CGNSO chairs, it is not said that the GAC has no - another proposal against it.

This seems to be found a misunderstanding here that Carlos has to sort out with you. Is that okay?

Olga Cavalli: Well, thank you, (Anna Beth), for the opportunity. Just for you to know that the e-mail from one of the co-chairs of this working group does community work and has been sent to the whole regional RALO list. And I have translated the statement of Mr. Carlos Gutierrez into this list.

He says that the GAC has made another proposal against this working group with a broader definition. If I am not mistaken, the GAC working group was defined and established before this cross-community working group - we started after the Dublin meeting in 2012 - and that the GAC has neglected consistently its participation in this group.

This is not true. You know that I have made efforts to participate, you know, for some reason, other members of the GAC don't participate and - I mean, you cannot force people to participate in their working group, but I've been following up. And also, he says that we don't know, also, much about the GAC about this issue.

This is absolutely not true because the members - the co-chairs of the working group were invited to the open session with it in Singapore. He himself was seated in the table when we did open all the - documents for community comments. So, honestly, these comments are really - have struck me very much.

I would like to know if this is the sense of the other co-chairs and of the group, and if not, please - an e-mail explaining this should be sent to the RALO list. Also, he says that this has happened in spite of the fact that it's leaded by Argentina. What does it mean?

What does it mean? There are 30 countries in the working group. I am the chair -- only the chair. So what does this statement mean?

What I have done is including the - this is an open list. It's a - so you can check the full content. Unfortunately, it's in Spanish, but you can check, also, if my translation is fair.

Spanish is my first language -- my mother tongue. So I think that the cross-community working group chairs - co-chairs - should make a clarification into the regional At-Large RALO list explaining that these affirmations are not exact and are not true. And the reference about Argentina, they are not informing and not doing all the things that are said in the e-mail list should be clarified as soon as possible, please.

And I would like to know the sense from the whole group - other co-chairs - if you agree with this statement made one - by one of the co-chairs.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I may - not as a co-chair, but as someone who is a little bit experienced with the list, including the (LAC) RALO list - Cheryl for the record - I don't know whether Carlos wrote in English or wrote in Spanish. But I do know that the automatic translations between the English to Spanish and Spanish to English which do occur on that list are a constant source of amusement to even me with my limited language skills because of the garbled text which frequently comes out.

So I think it's something that needs to be sorted out on the list. I certainly think that Olga and Carlos need to clarify exactly what is fact and what it either intended or missing (unintelligible) text era. And that needs to be done, you know, on the list, and perhaps with the assistance of the regional staff for that.

I'm not quite so convinced that it's a matter for our working group. If there's issues - and I believe there are issues that need to be clarified here, Olga - don't get me wrong. I'd be infuriated if I saw that text and it was something that I was representing. Yes, that - it needs to be sorted out but it - unless it's sorted out on the (LAC) RALO list, then a piece of import from the co-chairs to that list won't have as much impact as I think a proper clarification discussion and, if need be, debate and retraction would happen.

And I think Carlos does need to respond to Olga. But I would also remind both Carlos and Olga as well as (unintelligible) that the - if any automatic translation has occurred, it is beyond fraught with danger because it usually - and far too frequently in the past - has produced gobbeldy-gook. So I think we need to take it from a technical check point of view as well as a intended text and commentary point of view.

Let me also assure you that, having read (Olga's) copy to our list, there is factual inaccuracy right at the beginning as to what the ALAC is calling for. The ALAC was not calling for additional people to join our group - far from it. The ALAC was calling for people to contribute to the discussion, debate, and input that the ALAC is putting together on the question but we have out on three-letter codes.

So there is misquote either on the intention of the ALAC. You know, (Alan's) letter in the e-mail is very clear because he sent the draft to me in English - and I approved that draft before it went out. And it says, "Cheryl has been the person on this working group. She would like to have another pin-holder and other input to put together the responses to the questions on three-letter country codes.

So even that part of the text from Carlos is garbled, so let's sort that out, but I would strongly encourage that it is done with the list admin and the At-Large staff and not necessarily to try, in any way, suggest that this sort of attitude is being held by the co-chairs or, indeed, the rest of this working group. Thanks.

(Annebeth Lange): It's (AnnebethYu) again. And, (unintelligible), you want to respond. I think you have your hand up.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Thank you, Cheryl. I know that English is my second language, but I think I can manage. Also, (Spanish) is my mother's tongue so I know what Carlos meant in that e-mail. I - you can check the full e-mail in the list that I have included the link. But I understand your point, just to clarify that.

And also, I think it's an issue of the whole working group because an e-mail - a letter has been sent to our chair about why the GAC is not so much involved. So I think it is somehow something that is an interest of the whole group.

So this is why I brought this issue and - in spite of the fact that you mentioned that this is because the three-letter codes question or questionnaire, he is referring, specifically, to the role of the GAC and the role of Argentina in leading the working group within the GAC. So - and I do speak English; it's my second language (unintelligible). Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr I'm not suggesting. Olga, Cheryl here. I wasn't suggesting that your interpretation was in any way, shape, or form wrong. I was saying that the list - notorious in LACRALO for garbling things and it needs to be checked. I also said that there is heightened incorrectness in what is in that text even to what the regions are being asked to do.

So I am agreeing with you that it needs to be sorted out. I just think it is a LACRALO list issue that needs to be sorted out on that list as much as anything else. Now, if the co-chairs want to write a letter to the list, fine, but there is more that needs to be sorted out within the region, I would suggest as well.

Olga Cavalli: If I may, his e-mail he sent as a co-chair of this working group. This is why I sent this information to the mailing list of the working group.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr That is good.

Olga Cavalli: I'm stopping here because we don't have to spend so much time on this.
Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr Yes.

(Annebeth Lange): No, and this is (Anna Beth) again, Olga. I think that it is some kind of misunderstanding here because - and you are talking a little - of two different things because this has nothing to do with the three-letter codes questionnaire. This has to do with the wish to have a closer relationship between the working group of the GAP and (unintelligible) working group and the part that has to do with the content territory names.

But I really think that Carlos and Olga, you have to sort this out. And it's a little unfortunate that Carlos is not here today. But I do think that is the kind of misunderstanding here.

So should we just let it lie there until you and Carlos have sorted this out and find out how to deal with it? Would that be satisfying?

Man: (Anna Beth), (Anna Beth).

(Annebeth Lange): Yes.

Man: Before you move on, it's - (Corrine) and Heather have their hand up.

(Annebeth Lange): I'm not sure they have been up all the time. Do you want it again or is it you've forgotten to take down again.

(Corrine): Sorry, old hand.

(Annebeth Lange): Okay.

Heather Forrest: And I'm just a new hand, (Anna Beth).

(Annebeth Lange): You are new. Okay, Heather, come on.

Heather Forrest: Thank you. Look, I agree, (Anna Beth). I think it's - there's no reason to belabor the point here. For many of us, this is a first-time issue.

(Annebeth Lange): Yes.

Heather Forrest: Look, I haven't spoken to Carlos about this and Carlos is traveling.

Woman: No, (unintelligible) I. I'm not on the LACRALO list. My Spanish is no longer good enough to read the communication in its original language.

But I will say this; I do think, from my point of view, it is true to say that the GAC, as a whole is not so much involved. All of you reacted to that in a negative or surprised way, and it is the case that we haven't - we simply, as a fact, we haven't had very many GAC members participate.

As you point out, there are many reasons for that -- IANA transition and other things -- however, I personally have viewed for a very long time that it's unfortunate that we don't have more GAC participants. Our wish is not simply that you participate as a representative for others, be it the working group or the GAC as a whole.

But as you say, we can't force members of any SO or AC to participate. So I do think that that's the truth -- a factual statement. We have not had very many GAC members participate in their individual capacity, and I think that's

unfortunate because the spirit of this working group has always been to be open and to welcome others.

The second point that you raised is that we're not aware of GAC activity - the GAC working group activity. And again, I think there's an element of truth to that. We have completely different working methods - completely different working methods.

And you pointed out that while there have been opportunities to attend public sessions and face-to-face meetings, that's not the same in participating in these calls, participating in the actual work that happens of these groups. And it's just a fact of life that GAC work happens behind closed doors in working groups that are not open to the public, whereas, our meetings, to the extent that you sent a list or a request to (Bardo) or (Lars) should be added to the list shouldn't be able to participate in these calls.

So I don't see a blatant, factual inaccuracy in saying that there isn't a complete transparency in what happens in meetings because there isn't. You know, I wouldn't say there's complete transparency necessarily for the GAC in our meetings because individual GAC members haven't participated in the way that we would have hoped.

And we, of course, can't participate in the GAC working groups. And given that you are the only member of the GAC working group that we've interacted with, I think it's natural that we associate the working group with you. We understand that you're the chair.

I do recall having asked in a previous face-to-face meeting - it might have been Buenos Aires. I'm not sure who the other members of the working group were. And I believe you named one or two, but it's still not clear to me, personally, who the various members of the working group are within that GAC.

That may simply be a communicate breakdown. That may be that that information is available and hasn't been - I haven't heard or I've misunderstood. So I suspect that - as (Anna Beth) said - this is a misunderstanding. I personally see elements of truth in what's been said.

But, perhaps, I don't understand the linguistic clarifications of things the way that things have been articulated. I do think - and, of course, it is the purpose of the letter that (Anna Beth) has mentioned between (Johnathan Robinson) as chair of the GNSO and (Byron Holland) as chair of the CGNSO to encourage more work and better, clearer lines of communication between our groups.

It has been a topic of extensive discussion within the GNSO that there are these different working methods in the GAC and what happens in a GAC working group is not in the same process as what happens, for example, in the CWG and how do we deal with that? And of course, the GNSO has a - the middle of developing strategies for engaging with the GAC.

So I think that's a more general initiative. That's my - I don't mean to push this out any further. However, I did think it was important to offer that clarification in relation to what's been said. Thank you.

(Annebeth Lange): Thank you, Heather. I see that (Paul) has his hand up as well. (Paul), do you want to comment?

(Paul Zeiger): Yes, and I'll keep it very brief because, otherwise, we'll lose the entirety of the call and I do have to get off at the top of the hour. I'll try and dust off my diplomacy skills, which have atrophied considerably.

But the point I'd like to make is that Olga raises a valid issue. She has - there is - or at least a piece - have been some confusion, possible misrepresentation, possible misunderstanding. We simply don't know.

I apologize, Olga, I can't comment on what Carlos had said until at least I've heard from Carlos as well. But I do understand where your concerns come from whether there are some factual accuracies and some inaccuracies and, well, that does need to be resolved.

So while I don't propose it necessarily become a one-on-one between you type thing, I think the co-chairs should be - if you can continue the discussion with Carlos but leave us a co-chairs on the communication so that we can then come forward with our views, we can get something sorted out and we'd need not take any longer of the call today but other than to note that it's noted and we'll follow it up after the call.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, (Paul). And I totally agree with you. We will sort this out.

(Annebeth Lange): So should we - (unintelligible) we continue with the next issue on the agenda? The next item is discussion of the status of (unintelligible). What is the status today? How are they created?

And it would be useful to start to prepare a discussion paper before the next conference call on the current practice and we will have three other things that we did. While reading earlier transcripts, there seems to be a lot of confusion out there. How have they been created historically?

How were they created in the first round of gTLD? So we will set out in the applicant guidebook at (unintelligible). We'll let the (unintelligible) further for the staff to do until the next meeting. Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: We'll try. We have something called the Dublin Meeting upcoming, but we'll do our best.

(Annebeth Lange): And if we can't have it to the next, we will be (unintelligible) discuss it in Dublin, so that's fine. So - and that leads us to the next item -- the progress report for Dublin.

There is planned another conferenced called the Before Dublin that we'll see how that turns out -- if we have something new to discuss before Dublin. If we have input on the questions asked today, I hope they can be included.

And the more of the options paper we can tackle and not use the time to discuss, the better. So that does not mean that we cannot come back to it when we are through with the elements and other mandates. But to have any progress, we have to move forward.

It is possible to prepare a new progress report before Dublin. Since we had the face-to-face meeting in Dublin on Monday, the 19 - is it 12:30, Bart? Do you remember?

Bart Boswinkel: Excuse me. I think it's 11:30, but I'm not sure.

(Annebeth Lange): 11:30.

Bart Boswinkel: What I'll do is I'll ask - I'll send an e-mail to the list tomorrow morning, my time, to confirm the timing of the meeting in Dublin.

(Annebeth Lange): Yes, (Maurica) also said 11:30. Thank you, (Maurica). So, okay - so will we have a new progress report to discuss in Dublin? Hello?

Man: Sorry, did you ask...

(Annebeth Lange): So - yes.

Man: Yes, I've been switching between taking notes and answering your questions.

(Annebeth Lange): Yes, sure. Sure, I understand (unintelligible). You're already writing this down -- progress report to Dublin. That's fine. So we're through with the

agenda now, so does anyone have any comments to what we have discussed today?

Anything to add?

(Paul Zeiger): (Anna Beth), it's (Paul) here if I just may add a quick one.

(Annebeth Lange): Sure, sure.

(Paul Zeiger): My only point is to highlight the importance to everyone of - the way I see it, at least, and I'm not necessarily speaking for the other co-chairs, but, at least myself, that we've got the two elements of work so that the background information that (Anna Beth's) talking about to so we understand the status quo with three-letter codes.

As ever, that is a very important foundation because everybody's got to have a good understanding of where we're at before we start wandering off into our deliberation. We've got to start from the same point. So that's why I think that one is absolutely critical.

Progress report - that's more of a secondary thing from my perspective and as much as anybody who's followed - it's nice to take stock as we move along. But anybody who's been following the group, you know, or certainly within the group, knows where we are. So it's a secondary sort of reporting mechanism.

Given that we're out with the community at the moment and we have asked for input, there's a possibility that the stuff we get back might be a little bit - could be garbled or it could have some misunderstanding. So that's why I think it's absolutely essential that we get the background and the status quo sorted out at some point...

(Annebeth Lange): Yes.

(Paul Zeiger): ...because I think that will very much influence some of the response we could get survey-wise - questionnaire-wise.

(Annebeth Lange): Yes. It's (Anna Beth) here. Yes, I totally agree. If you read the transcripts and read them through the teleconferences we have had, you see that it's a lot of opinions or some - and what we think is the background out there that differs a lot from the one person to another.

So I think it's really important to find out what has been happening, what have the (unintelligible) been doing, what are we doing today, before we move on.

Woman: (Unintelligible) here.

(Annebeth Lange): Yes.

Woman: That'll certainly help our regions out...

(Annebeth Lange): Yes. Yes, yes, sure. And the one thing is us but it's a lot of other people out there. And when we ask the community for input, it's even more important to have the track on the table so they know what they are answering.

So anyone else have to comment on the - what we have been discussing today?

Woman: No, but if there's anything...

(Annebeth Lange): No.

Woman: If there's anything on the list I don't know when I'll be getting internet back on, so I'll be limited to...

(Annebeth Lange): Okay.

Woman: ...when I am on the property. And so...

(Annebeth Lange): Yes.

Woman: ...apologize for that. And if possible, before you disconnect, Bart, could you just hang in this call for a moment and have a brief word with me on another matter?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes I will.

(Annebeth Lange): Okay, then thank you very much everyone for attending. And I really encourage you to talk to your other community members and try to give us as much as possible on this (unintelligible) so we know what to do next. So thank you very much.

And for those of you in Australia, have a nice day. And for the others on the Northern Hemisphere, good night; talk to you next time.

Woman: Thank you, (Anna Beth). Good night.

Woman: Thanks, (Anna Beth).

Woman: Bye-bye.

Woman: Fantastic.

Woman: Thanks, (Anna Beth).

(Annebeth Lange): Bye-bye.

END