

**Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Country/Territory Names as TLDs
TRANSCRIPT
Tuesday 23 September 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-20140923-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#sep>

Attendees:

ccNSO

Ron Sherwood, .vi
Mirjana Tasic, .rs
Laura Hutchison, .uk
Lise Fuhr, .dk
Mary Uduma, .bg
Paul Szyndler, .au

GNSO

Chris Chaplow, BC
Heather Forrest, IPC (Co-Chair)
Maxim Alzoba, NTAG
Scott Harlan, IPC

At-Large

Cheryl Langdon-Orr

Apologies:

Annebeth Lange, .no
Jordi Iparraguirre, ccNSO Council NomCom appointee
Carlos Liuzzi

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Gery
Bart Boswinkel
Patrick Jones
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Anna). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the Cross Community Working Group on Use of Country Territory Names as TLDs on the 23rd of September, 2014.

On the call today we have Paul Szyndler, Mirjana Tasic, Lise Fuhr, Ron Sherwood, Maxim Alzoba, Laura Hutchison, Heather Forrest and Scott Harlan.

We have apologies from Annebeth Lange, Jordi Iparraguirre and Carlos Luizzi.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Patrick Jones, 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, Lise.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Hello, everyone. As the co-chair I'll be chairing the call today. And I hope everyone is doing fine. Well, our first item on the agenda is to invite the GAC group to the full working group meeting. And I know that Marika has some news regarding this. Marika, can you fill us in?

Marika Konings: Sorry, Lise, which item would you like me to update on?

Lise Fuhr: That was to invite the GAC group to the full working group meeting. You had some news regarding GAC?

Marika Konings: Right, yeah, just some feedback on the way that the group is structured because basically the group that's looking at the geographic names issue is actually a sub group of the Future of New gTLDs Working Group. I think that's looking more broadly, from a GAC perspective, at the new gTLDs and potential future around and procedures.

So I think the suggestion was that if the working group wants to invite the GAC working group that probably the chair of the full working group should also be brought into the loop even though it may only be the sub group that were mainly interested in meeting with us.

So I think Bart has his hand already up so I'm sure he will correct me if I said anything wrong but I think (unintelligible).

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Hi, Lise. This is Bart. Yeah, just, say, as a result of the last call when this item was discussed I've sent an email to Olga Cavalli who is the chair of the sub group. She responded that she would be available to talk to the co-chairs. But we assume that the full working group wants to meet with the full sub working group.

So if it's okay with you, Lise and Heather and Paul, as the co-chairs, I will invite them and do as Marika suggested also include the chair of that GAC working group in the CC. And hope we have an opportunity to meet with them on - at the face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles. That was it.

Lise Fuhr: So to sum up, Bart, you will have the co-chairs meeting with the chair or with Olga and we'll have - inviting the whole working group to our face-to-face meeting...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, the sub working group to, say, the sub working group dealing with the geographic names meeting with - because of the risk of overlap, etcetera. So

the sub working group of the GAC invite them to attend the working group meeting in LA.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Any questions regarding our first item?

Paul Szyndler: Lise, this is Paul here. More than anything I'm testing my phone line to make sure that you can all hear me. But I've got no concerns with that. I think that's appropriate.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah. Heather, are you fine with it, too?

Heather Forrest: Yes, yes thank you. This is Heather. I - and, Bart, just to clarify so we're 100% on - it might just be that I'm - it's early for me and I wasn't clear on what Lise said. There is no meeting between the co-chairs and the chair as it were, the meeting is strictly whole group to whole group.

Bart Boswinkel: That's the intent, yes.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, that's what I would support.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Well then I got it wrong because I thought we would have both. But I'm fine with having the meeting as a whole group, yes. Okay. Well then no more questions regarding Item Number 1? We'll go on to the second item.

Heather Forrest: Actually, this is Heather.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah.

Heather Forrest: May I interject very quickly? I do understand that in terms of Item Number 1, in terms of the status of the - of the initiative of that sub working group what I understand is that there is the possibility - I think there's an aim within the GAC working group that the proposal that is being working - that is being worked on within that sub working group, the sub working group on

geographic names, that a revised version of that proposal will be available between now and LA and that it would be put out for public comment informally I suppose, not for the usual mechanisms, ICANN public comment mechanisms.

But that is the status of that and that to the extent that we have - that any of us receives or sees that proposal I think it would be helpful to circulate at least notice of it by email so that this group has full notice of it and an opportunity to read it prior to LA.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Heather, that's a very good idea. But do you know if the sub working group is going to present it in a public meeting or is it only being for written comments?

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. I think the intention is that there is an opportunity found within the Los Angeles meeting to present it but I don't think that that's been firmly scheduled but it is my understanding that the entire working group is agreed that this be put out for public comment.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Marika, you're having your hand up.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. On the discussion in the GAC what I've understood is that it's currently scheduled for Wednesday morning from 9:30-10:00 local time so LA time - to be discussed during the GAC session which I believe is open to anyone interested.

Heather Forrest: Okay.

Lise Fuhr: Any further on Item 1? Okay, I'll move on. The Item Number 2 is our second reading of the typology - the second call for support on the basis for further work. Does anyone have any questions or comments regarding this? Awfully quiet out there.

Paul Szyndler: Lise, if I can assist, it's Paul here. Obviously I'm very willing to go back through the history as everyone's already read in the final report of the study group regarding the typology why we chose to use it, how we used it and the outcomes that came from it.

Given that we have a limited number of people on this call, most of them, I think they're already familiar with it I don't see the need to go through it in detail again but I still remain happy to do so in LA depending upon how many of our colleagues are happy to turn up at 8:00 am.

Lise Fuhr: I think that's a very good idea. So - but still - so that means you propose that we don't have the second call for support or you just - we close the second call and then you'll still do explanations on the face-to-face meeting?

Paul Szyndler: Well I believe now that all members of the working group have had ample time to both read through the final recommendations of the study group and raise any questions if they felt they needed to about the typology. I'm happy to go through it again but I expect this to be a second call. This is...

Lise Fuhr: Okay.

Paul Szyndler: ...the final call as far as I'm concerned in terms of any questions or queries. In the absence of any over the last call or before that I think we're in a position where we're empowered to proceed.

For anyone that's unaware, the typology was just basically a tool that we used to allow us to have some sort of systematic approach to how we identified and looked and country and territory names. And there was, during the work of the study group, no concerns raised about the methodology. And I'm happy to accept this as a second call unless someone has any questions.

But, Lise, it's ultimately up to you but there's been an absence of comments or concerns over the last few calls.

Lise Fuhr: No, but I agree with you; I think we should make it a second call. And because we need to move forward and, as you say, there hasn't been any questions or comments so I'm happy with it. So I'm - I think we should move forward. But any comments, any questions? I don't see any...

Heather Forrest: This is Heather.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah.

Heather Forrest: I suppose one comment to make would be that the purpose of the study group and the purpose of the working group or the scope of the two is somewhat different. And with that in mind the typology was an extremely helpful tool in the study group.

It may be that our recommendation as a working group work with one or multiple categories within the typology. I suppose it's just helpful to say that the typology is not - is not the answer, if you like, to this working group - it's the question I suppose.

Paul Szyndler: Heather, Lise if I may again? It's Paul. I can't help but agree. I'm conscious of the amount of time we spend looking backward and the amount of time we start looking forward. And given that there haven't been any concerns about the typology such as it was, a tool for the study group, I think we need to move on and then look at whether that needs to morph in any way, were there any changes proposed as we start getting on with our work with the working group.

But that's the only reason why I don't want to go into it any great detail because we've spent an awful lot of time already doing that.

Lise Fuhr: Any further comments? No? Well I'll conclude then we (end) the second call for the typology. And I think we should move on to the straw man report - the

draft progress report. And I know, Bart, you all had it in your email with the agenda. And there has been some more writing done on it. And one of it is we have a - sorry? Bart?

((Crosstalk))

Lise Fuhr: I was just un-muting. Oh yeah, you were un-muting, getting ready for explaining what has been added to the report, will you do that, Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, thank you, Lise. This is Bart for transcript purposes. So if you look at the second version of the straw man, say, we had some discussion around the phrasing of the decisions of the working group. You will see that the second decision is marked awaiting - was awaiting today's call to be - to make it definite. So based on today that's been done.

I've added some language around what the working group notes and draws attention to the evolution. Say, I've sent you, on the previous version, I've sent you the final report itself and a comparison. I will not include them in - I suggest not to include them in the progress report to include links. As you will see that's a change made.

Secondly, I've added some language to the working method and process followed to date. Again, that was the result of the discussion a few weeks ago that it is very important that the community understands the working method of the working group and the process that has been followed to date in order to avoid any discussion around the process and whether or not it had - it was inclusive and transparent.

So that's been - so first of all decision making - a description of the decision process as we've done right now with the typology and previous with the policy overview.

Then the process to date so what the working group has done to date, again, what was necessary so that's a bit - it's a bit more language to the work plan to date.

And for the first working face-to-face meeting, again, or at its first face-to-face meeting the working group agreed to work on a work plan leading up to the LA meeting, which we've done. And if you look at the work plan itself we met all the milestones.

Also included now is a section called Next Steps so what will happen as of LA and beyond and a bit on the focus area so that's reconfirmation of the issues identified. And this goes back to the discussion we had in London and initial discussion agreement on the feasibility because that's one of the first deliverables - real deliverables, new deliverables of the working group, say, initial agreement on feasibility of a framework if that's deemed feasible.

And probably, and this is a suggestion as we discussed as well, agreement on design parameters and principles for such a framework so what are the guiding principles in developing those - such a framework. And that would be - that's my guesstimation. This would take the working group up to the Marrakesh meeting.

So my suggestion based on, say, just on the experience to date with this working group and with the study group as a support staff would be that, say, between now or between the LA meeting and Marrakesh we have a bit more detailed work plan dealing with these two major topics and then maybe discuss and overall work plan. But that's not included in the progress report.

And then finally I've included references to the documents so they do not need to be included in this progress report itself so it becomes nice and handy. So it's just a two-pager instead of having the two full reports included. These are the major changes. Lise, over to you.

Lise Fuhr: Yes. Are there any questions or comments to the report? Because it's now or we will publish it as it is. I don't see any hands. Okay. We'll conclude on - the wording and this is what we're going to bring with us to the LA meeting and present.

This will be present on the Website, Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart. Yes, we will post it at least on the working group page; we'll include it in the - on the ccNSO homepage and maybe - but that's - this is just for the ccNSO side. I don't know whether Marika or Lars, you have any ideas to inform the GNSO community around progress and the wider community. But maybe that's something we can discuss offline how to make this more published so more people are aware of the progress itself.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah. I don't know if you can make some news about it or whatever we do but I think we should try and make it known to the other ACs and SOs anyway.

Bart Boswinkel: But that's more the logistics of it. So we'll make it, say, we will start from the premise that it needs to be distributed as widely as possible.

Lise Fuhr: Yes. And thank you for the good work.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hi, sorry I'm late. Cheryl here.

Bart Boswinkel: Hi, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hi. Had an eldest boy in hospital so not quite my normal setup.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Any other comments? Well, we concluded on this one. We'll go on to the preparation of face-to-face meeting in LA. I don't know if we can put up the agenda items we have been talking about in the - between the chair and co-chairs. Is that Nathalie or is it you, Bart, who puts that up?

Nathalie Peregrine: Hello, this is Nathalie. I've just lost network connectivity right now. The document was uploaded in Adobe Connect so maybe if someone who's host, Lars or Marika, could show it in the room that will be great. It's called LA Face-to-face Draft Agenda.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, there it is.

Lise Fuhr: There it is. Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much.

Lise Fuhr: And this is a first draft of the agenda. And if anyone has anything to add please join in and give - propose anything. But what we've been - as we've been talking about we'd like to have a meeting with the GAC initiative. And that's for 15 minutes.

And then we have the work plan that Bart has discussed in our next step in our report. And it is - I've been talking or the co-chairs have been talking with staff that they might prepare a work plan and have a draft for that, a straw man work plan. And so we can prepare and have something to discuss during the meeting.

And I don't know, Bart, will you explain a little bit more about ideas.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, this is Bart. It's, say, there are two issues here and maybe Marika can allude to one because this is really GNSO work. Say, there are two I think very important parameters for the work plan of this working group. The first one, and the major one, is the ongoing work or the work that's starting on a review of the new - in preparation of the second round of the new gTLD process.

So that's one parameter and maybe, Marika, can you say anything about it, say, if there are - about the initiatives in the GNSO and a little bit about their timelines.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. So I think there are several parallel initiatives going on of course not only in the GNSO but I think as well in other communities looking at, you know, reviewing the new gTLD program as well preparing for a next round what needs to happen when - which issues need to be addressed.

So to that end there is a discussion group currently formed in the GNSO that's trying to identify which issues need to be addressed before next round, you know, which need to be done through policy development, you know, what are implementation related concerns.

And then of course there's also a lot of work going on I think from the staff side on some of the reviews that were either, you know, requested or as part of, for example, of the Affirmation of Commitments that are also being done in parallel. So there are some reports that have been published, actually, yesterday outlining some of those timelines.

So I think the idea is to have a discussion around how that would tie in with the work of this effort and, you know, whether or not that affects, for example, the timeline that this working group is moving along on.

Bart Boswinkel: So that's one parameter. And the second one - and that's more, say, if you look at where we are and what we just discussed is the internal, say, development, excuse me, of a framework itself. As I said, there will be some, yeah, you can say see some milestones. One is a decision whether or an advice, a recommendation, to the participating SOs and ACs and to the broader community whether a framework is feasible.

And secondly, if it's feasible then this working group and that's probably will be the major task is to develop one and propose one to the community to seek their support and/or endorsement.

So my suggestion would be to at least say, first, have an overall long-term view on what needs to be delivered and then come up on the second, say, as I just said, say, that we have a more detailed work plan between the LA meeting and the Marrakesh meeting to deal with the two, say, have a discussion around the issues as identified by the study group and whether this group is comfortable moving down that path.

And secondly, have a discussion around the framework feasibility and if it's feasible a little bit about the groundwork what should be the ground or the guiding principles. And if we can manage this between the LA meeting and the Marrakesh I think this working group has done very well. So these are the two parameters we want to include in the work plan.

Lise Fuhr: Bart, can I - well I think, yes, these are the two parameters and at the same time we need to ensure that the GAC initiatives works together with our initiative and the GNSO initiative and not working together but the timing is important regarding...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Lise Fuhr: ...that we have three groups working on this issue at the same time.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, they should be aligned. Yeah.

Lise Fuhr: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: So that's a bit about, say, some - and my suggestion would be that Marika and I would prepare a draft and this so that will be distributed to the working group, say, at - late as one week before the meeting in LA to have a fulsome

discussion around it so we don't need to do it on the fly because if you look at the LA agenda it will be already we have one hour and it will be quite full.

Lise Fuhr: Yes. But I have a question regarding the new gTLD program review and assessment that were sent out yesterday, that's a purely ICANN staff work plan, right? That's nothing to do with GNSO.

Bart Boswinkel: Marika, you're more...

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. What has been published indeed is, you know, the work that staff has undertaken in relation to some of the efforts such as reviews and information gathering. But that information is expected to feed into the GNSO processes as, you know, the GNSO maps out the work that needs to be done as it also will need to align with, you know, some of the information that may become available as a result of some of those reviews.

So indeed the timelines are a staff effort but at least it's my expectation that to a certain extent will also influence how the GNSO may roll out the work it identifies that would need to be done ahead of a next round.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Thank you, Marika. Is there any questions or comments for this action point about the working plan or the work plan that staff is going to prepare for us? Do we have consensus that we're going to have this and try and discuss it at the meeting?

Paul Szyndler: Lise, it's Paul here, if I may? I'm sorry, my Adobe room is hung at the moment but - so I can't see if anybody else has raised their hand but can I...

((Crosstalk))

Lise Fuhr: No, they have not so you are free to speak.

Paul Szyndler: It's me. All right, the only issue I have - I sort of want to raise this back to a macro level as opposed to the LA to Marrakesh meeting level. We've obviously all seen various discussions coming out about second round being possibly 2017 and then the most recent material talking about possibly 2016. So these are all things that we need to keep in mind as part of our ongoing deliberations.

I don't think - I don't think it's something that we immediately need to address now but as long as we can keep all relevant stakeholders advised of what we're doing and informed of what we're doing I think we'll be well positioned over the next year or two.

What I'm conscious of is that the study group operated under the understanding that we don't know how long it's going to take for the second round to start happening. We're now starting to see some dates or some potential dates staked out in collective calendars. So I'm just conscious of that.

Something that we need to keep in mind as we're moving forward, not necessarily to react to that but just to keep in mind where the rest of the community is going.

And I also wanted to flag a separate issue about something that was raised with me about - a number of times about the recent announcement from Neustar about - or the recent request from Neustar about country and territory names at the second level which the fact that it's actually been raised with me is interesting because that is outside of the scope of this group.

Country and territory names at the second level was not something that we were ever meant to look at. But I'm just mentioning it now because of the fact that it was raised with me a number of times by a number of people and it just goes to show that there's still a little bit of misunderstanding in the community

about the scope of what our group is supposed to do and what may be going on as part of other processes.

So I'm just throwing that in there as a - and advice, as a heads up so to speak rather than anything we can specifically address. But it just goes to show that there's still a general misunderstanding amongst the community as to what we're addressing and what others are. And that might be something we need to keep in mind as we move forward.

Lise Fuhr: Oh yes we certainly do. Well maybe we could - I don't know if we can put any - as a starting text in our draft report but, let's see, or we need to address it in any other way but...

Bart Boswinkel: Lise, this is Bart. My suggestion would be to just - and then that's - and I hope that the working group accepts this, I'll just copy and paste part of the - especially the scope and the limitation of scope as a starting point and an introduction into the progress report so people understand what this working group is about. This was written with the idea that everybody knew. But reiterating again the objective, the scope and especially the limitation of scope might be useful in that context and put that in the progress report.

Paul Szyndler: Bart, and again it's Paul. I think, given my experience over the last few days, that would be very useful and very appropriate for us to reiterate our position and our scope over and over again. So I can't help but agree.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather...

Mary Uduma: Hello, this is Mary.

((Crosstalk))

Mary Uduma: Hello?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Mary Uduma: Hello, can you hear me?

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: We hear you, Mary.

Mary Uduma: All right. This is Mary. I also support what Bart has suggested. I think it's critical and it will be helpful and it will clear some gray areas as support staff.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Mary. And we had Heather?

Heather Forrest: Yes, apologies. I think this - what we're discussing now is going to be an issue even more than or just as much as the timing of these other groups working in this area. I think it would be helpful if we had, even for internal use within the group, a one pager summary on the scope of the GAC working group initiative, the scope of the GNSO review and whether that will go to, you know, top level, second level, and our own.

I suppose ideal would be if that one pager were able to be made public but whether we could get agreement on the other groups as to how we word the thing. I think it would be - I think it would be very helpful to have this one page initiatives within ICANN on country and territory names, here are the groups and here's that what they're doing and here are their timelines.

Lise Fuhr: I think...

Bart Boswinkel: And...

Lise Fuhr: ...that's a very good idea.

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart. Maybe that's one of the items, say, that we - that I could include in the invitation to, say, the GAC initiative sub working group so they explain - and maybe they can provide us up front with, say, a statement of scope and their expected delivery dates put down in nice words.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. I think that would be marvelous if we can do it, I think that would be excellent.

Heather Forrest: Good idea.

Mary Uduma: Yeah, this is Mary. I think also it would be excellent. The synergy is (unintelligible) thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah. Good. Any more comments or questions regarding this part? Still the discussion of the working plan. No. Then, well, I conclude on this specific issue that we'll ask staff, Marika and Bart, to prepare the work plan and in the invitation to the GAC you'll ask about this one pager.

And I - Marika, will you talk to the GNSO group about having this one pager too?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I can work with Bart on that.

Lise Fuhr: Okay perfect. And the next item we're planning to have is an overview of issues identified by the study groups' first discussion on feasibility. And that is to be presented by Paul with a Q&A. And, Paul, will you tell a little bit about the idea of this?

Paul Szyndler: Oh, I'm sorry, I had myself on mute there. I have to admit I didn't understand the idea of that we were talking about in terms of feasibility. But I had

assumed this was to do with whether or not what we'd proposed coming out of the study group was something that could be adopted by this group or otherwise. But please let me know if I'm missing the point here.

Lise Fuhr: Bart, you were the one that...

((Crosstalk))

Paul Szyndler: I didn't think this one was on me, sorry about that.

Bart Boswinkel: No, no it's more that, say, it's if you have a discussion around the issues, say, that will - and that should drift into, in my view, say, the discussion around the feasibility of a framework, how to resolve these issues. So once you - so that's more the context of discussing the issues in the first place, say.

At the end of the day this working group needs to have proposed or recommend to the community whether a framework, a broad framework, is feasible, that means achievable, and then go into it. So the issues will set that - is the first step and the discussion around the issues is a first step on discussing the feasibility of a framework. That's why I've included it.

Paul Szyndler: Right. Thank you, Bart. I've got that. This is Paul again. Yes, I understand that one of the major outcomes - possible outcomes of this working group is the feasibility or otherwise of a framework moving forward.

It's not something that I believe, we as a group, can discuss at the moment in terms of we're working on our scope, we're working out the preliminary issues we need to address and looking backwards at the outcomes of the study group. I don't believe that's something we can get into in any great detail at this stage. That's going to be a key decision for the group to make further down the track. I hope you agree, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: No, no absolutely, that's why it's called a first or initial. So in order to see what needs to be - how the working group wants to approach it over the next - because I think this will be the major topic between LA and the Marrakesh meeting.

((Crosstalk))

Paul Szyndler: Paul here again. Is there any general confusion amongst participants in the call today about what we mean by the feasibility of a universal or unified framework going forward? That's - that would be my question to start with.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. So I think that's - because as I said we only have one hour in LA and you do want to do some substantive work at the LA meeting, we've assumed. This would be probably the, yeah, the substantive part of the discussion. So the question you just raised.

Lise Fuhr: Yes.

Paul Szyndler: And that's not something that's to be determined on this call or subsequently but rather some - or necessarily in LA; it's about whether there is some utility, where there is some benefit. And we're probably going to need to work on - choose Bart's parlance, a straw man again about whether we can use some sort of framework going forward where there is uniformity between - when it comes to the use of country and territory names.

Is this something we can achieve? Is it something that's desirable - well desirability is something we've already addressed. But is it something that can be achieved is something that needs to be looked into further in LA. But I would be very hesitant to make any sort of preconceptions about that at this stage.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Lise Fuhr: I think that's a very good discussion for a face-to-face meeting because it's not an easy one and it's so much easier to be there in person and talk about it. So - but and I agree, this I the first discussion and - but we need to open the issue and find out a way forward so. Any other comments on exactly this one? Heather, are you...

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. No, Lise, thank you. I've - I don't have anything to add; I agree with what's been said.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Thank you. I don't see any hands raised so I go on to revisit work plan based on understanding of issues. That's actually - Bart and I had a discussion if we should put the work plan before the overview of issues or vice versa and instead we put in another item saying we revisit it just to make sure that we're still aligned with the work plan regarding the issues we identified.

So instead of having a discussion on what to put first or last we just have the work plan twice. I don't know if anyone has any comments to that. Well this is our idea of an agenda for the LA meeting. I don't know if anyone are missing any issues to be discussed or having any more ideas? Any wishes? I don't see any hands.

It's not that we can't put on additional items as we go along before the meeting but it's just if we want people to be prepared I think it's very important that we know the issues going to be discussed and we'll have the work plan a week before the meeting so to - in order for everyone to be prepared and have read the stuff so we can have a good discussion about it. Any more comments regarding preparation of...

Mary Uduma: I think we can still make input online.

Lise Fuhr: Yes, yes, yeah sorry, Mary. I agree, you can - of course you can make inputs online. What I just urge you to do is a week before it would be very nice to

have them at latest in order to prepare for anything for the meeting. So that's the only thing.

((Crosstalk))

Lise Fuhr: And of course you can bring them on later but just if you want to - a good discussion about it it's better to have it in time.

((Crosstalk))

Lise Fuhr: And please feel free to put in other issues regarding this work so anyone. Well, any more comments? I don't see any hands. Don't hear anyone so this is - until now, our agenda for our face-to-face meeting and I think Bart and Marika know what to do regarding the work plan and we have a - hopefully a one-pager regarding the different groups scope coming up. And I hope we can have that on the meeting too.

Do anyone have anything more to add for this meeting or I'll bring it to closure. That was not a threat so if anyone wants to add anything please. No, it's awfully quiet. Bart and Marika, are you fine with your tasks...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. I am, I don't know about Marika but.

Marika Konings: Yeah, all good.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. And my co-chairs, Paul and Heather, do you have anymore to add?

Paul Szyndler: I have no final comments other than to offer your thanks - offer my thanks for your chairing this session and dealing with that deathly silence. But nothing further from me.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Okay.

Heather Forrest: Nothing further from me, Lise. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Well thank you everyone for joining this conference call. And I hope you'll have a good day, evening or morning wherever you are in the world. And I look forward to see you all in LA.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Lise. Bye-bye everybody.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, everybody. Bye.

END