

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

Monday, 16 November 2015 at 21:00 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.

Attendees:

ccNSO:

Mirjana Tasic, .rs
Sanna Sahlman, .fi
Paul Szyndler, .au
Grigori Saghyan, .am

GNSO

Heather Forrest, IPC (Co-Chair)
Carlos Raul Gutierrez, NPOC (co-Chair)
Susan Payne, NTAG
Maxim Alzoba, NTAG
Colin O'Brien, IPC
Griffin Barnett, IPC

At-Large:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr

GAC:

ISO:

Other:

Apologies:
Laura Hutchinson, .uk
Jaap Akkerhuis
Annebeth Lange, .no

ICANN staff:
Bart Boswinkel
Marika Konings

Lars Hoffman
Patrick Jones
Karine Perset

Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: The recordings have been started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much, (Chris). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the CTN call on the 16th of November, 2015. On the call today we have Grigori Saghyan, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Heather Forrest, Susan Payne, Colin O'Brien, Mirjana Tasic, Paul Szyndler, Sanna Sahlman, Griffin Barnett, Carlos Gutierrez and Maxim Alzoba. We received apologies from Laura Hutchinson, Jaap Akkerhuis and Annebeth Lange.

From staff we have Bart Boswinkel, Patrick Jones, (unintelligible), Lars Hoffman 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. Good morning to everyone. Good afternoon, good evening in other time zones. This is our first meeting - first call of the Cross Community Working Group on Use of Country and Territory Names as gTLDs or as TLDs since ICANN 54 in Dublin. So welcome back. I hope everyone traveled back home safely from Dublin.

What we have done in terms of item Number 2, recap of what's happened, what we have done is we circulated some survey questions some time ago. Bart or Lars, remind us when did we actually send those questions? It was August I want to say - end of August-ish?

Lars Hoffman: Yeah, this is Heather - sorry...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh I hope not. If that's Heather we're in trouble, Lars.

Heather Forrest: Oh it's great for me. I'm glad to have someone capable take over for me. Good, Lars, go for it.

Lars Hoffman: I believe - this is Lars for the record - I believe, yes, we sent it out late August or early September. But we did send out a reminder just after Dublin to also extend the deadlines, etcetera. And so it's been definitely on the radar with people for about 2.5 months now, 10, 12 weeks.

Heather Forrest: Perfect. Thank you. Thank you, Lars. This is Heather. Thank you very much. And I think important to note as well that in addition to that email reminder during Dublin in our various meetings, for example, with the GNSO Council, the ccNSO, the meeting of the GAC and the GNSO, I can see that it happened as well from the GAC communiqué and the ccNSO in a GAC meeting, we made various entreaties in person to remind various communities around ICANN that this survey was out and existed.

I also was - drew the short straw, if you like, to speak at a panel that happened on Monday of new gTLD program reviews in the large room, I suppose. And had a good solid size group there and made a public notice of the fact that the survey was out and if anyone wanted that they should get in touch with me or Lars and I haven't heard from anyone.

So that tells us that we have the word out. What has happened in that - in that span of time, let's say, Dublin - during Dublin and since, we've received by my record size additional comments. We'll talk about them in the context of item Number 4. But that is indeed what has happened since Dublin is that the various communities that we're all attached to have taken some time to respond to our survey questions on three character codes and now it is up to us in terms of the work plan to Marrakesh - up to us to figure out what to do with those and how we progress.

We had set a goal of having some preliminary views of our own circulated by Marrakesh for discussion in Marrakesh so that was really the work plan that we had set ourselves when we first started on this journey with three letter codes. And that would fit next to our work on two letter codes, which was completed earlier this year. So - completed, let's say we've sat that in a position where we feel at this stage that we're happy with it.

And I think after we - my thinking here, and I'll turn the floor open is that we finalize as best we can our work on three letter codes. And I think we send that around to the community perhaps as a preliminary report on those two things and get some formal community input on our methodology, on the way that we're reporting things, on gaps perhaps, on expectations in terms of how we have covered those two issues, two and three letter codes.

Does anyone have any comments on that as an approach? And please do - we'll have a bit of anarchy here, simply speak up or I'll ask Bart or Lars to manage the hands up in the AC room because for some reason Adobe and I are getting on poorly this morning. So any comments on that approach?
Yeah, Lars.

Lars Hoffman: Sorry, Heather, this is Lars. I'm very happy to manage the queue. There's no hands up at the moment.

Heather Forrest: Thanks. Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Paul Szyndler: Heather, it's Paul here...

Heather Forrest: Yes, please.

Paul Szyndler: ...I'm happy to jump in. Look - Paul Szyndler for the record here. For what it's worth I agree with the path forward that Heather is proposing. As a cross community working group we are generally finding our way so - because we're blazing new ground so the way this work is being done - work has not been undertaken in the way it's being done in this group any time in the past.

As such, I don't think there's such a thing as too much consultation or too much commentary back to the community so that everybody is comfortable with how we're working and where we're going. So the whole idea of bundling together once we've completed our work on two and three letter codes, if I understood your question correctly, Heather, and then sort of sending that out to the community as to a status update of how we're going and whether there's any comments on that would be a really good idea.

Heather Forrest: Okay, thank you, Paul. Thank you very much. Anyone else want to comment? Excellent. All right, my thinking on that is - just to cap that item - is to say I think we all acknowledge that we're in the elephant in the room I suppose is the difficult territory ahead with names and to the extent that we have some community feedback on codes I think that would be helpful before we launch into names. We want to make sure that we have something that we're on a path that the community is - believes is compressive and believes is sufficiently robust before we move into codes or into names rather. So that's my thinking there.

Excellent. So item Number 3 in our agenda is the letter from Thomas Schneider, the Chair of the GAC, which last circulated at the end of last week

and/or mid last week. So that letter I suppose is a direct response to some interceding by the chairs of the ccNSO and the GNSO. So we separately went to the GNSO and the ccNSO with concerns - we being the chairs of this cross community working group in terms of scope and overlap of the work being done by the GAC working group on geographic names and this cross community working group.

And that resulted I'm personally pleased to see, in some better awareness on the part of the GAC chair and I suppose others within the GAC. I think one of the concerns that we've had for a while about what's going on in that GAC working group is not so much that the working group is going on but that it was going on and there were GAC members, including the chair, who weren't all that well informed as to what that group was doing.

And I think if anything our - our entreaty provoked some discussion within the GAC which I think is a very healthy thing. What that letter makes clear it seems is that the scope of the GAC working group is names that don't fall within the ISO 3166 list and that is primarily our mandate - the ISO 3166 list, although I will say this, and Paul can offer some comments as well, is that certainly in the study group there was some discussion as to whether our mandate went beyond the ISO 3166 list and I think that was probably discussed briefly in the context of this working group as well.

Paul, do you want to say anything about that, about the scope and the list?

Paul Szyndler: Not particularly, just simply because you've covered it off exactly the way I would have described it, Heather, so sorry, no particular color to add. You've got it.

Heather Forrest: Great. Thank you, Paul, thank you.

Carlos Gutierrez: Heather.

Heather Forrest: With that in mind...

Carlos Gutierrez: Heather.

Heather Forrest: Yes - yes, Carlos.

Carlos Gutierrez: Sorry I had to step out because I have to make a comment.

Heather Forrest: Okay.

Carlos Gutierrez: I have a lot of latency so I will speak slowly.

Heather Forrest: Okay.

Carlos Gutierrez: One question, since they have delimited everything that is not in ISO, doesn't it preclude us to continue working on the names - on the full names? Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: It's a good question, Carlos. The way that I - so response to you and then another comment from me. The way that I read the letter from Thomas is that we can continue with names as those appear on the ISO list. Now what it does is it raises - I think it pulls out of scope one of the things that we spent so much time on in the study group which is how do we deal with things that are related to names?

For example, cultural shortenings, for example, unofficial names, those I think probably get pulled out of our scope and it focuses our mandate - not to say that a document from the GAC should necessarily have an impact on our mandate but I think we can use this as an opportunity to do so to clarify our own mandate. It's not forcing us to do so but I think it's an opportunity.

So official names as they appear and I suppose we also need to come to come to grips when we get there with translations and if so what languages. Paul, your thoughts on that given that you chaired the headache that we had in the study group on this question?

Paul Szyndler: Thanks, Heather. Paul Szyndler here again. Honestly I'm a little bit torn as to the reading, I mean, I've read that many diplomatically worded government speak documents in the past. I - to be honest I didn't actually read Thomas's note as necessarily limiting the scope of what we could or should work on but rather by stating it he's making clear that this is (unintelligible) but I don't - I don't believe that the intention of the note would have been to limit us too but rather making clear that this is our - in other words, work deriving from 3166 is the starting point. I can't see any intention on his part to necessarily limit us.

In a way I'd like to park the issue for a while because we'll see how it goes and what the environment is like when we get to those issues because let's face it, working through three letter codes and then starting to get to names is going to take quite a while. So we can take a, you know, take the temperature of the environment once we get to that point. But I still believe it would be worthwhile for this working group to head down the same rabbit warren that the study group did if only for the sake of thoroughness.

But again, we're doing these things with a due process but with a degree of flexibility as we go. So I'm - it's worth noting but I'd like to sort of park it and let's see how it goes as we get beyond three letter codes which no doubt are still going to take us quite a while.

Heather Forrest: Fair enough. Fair enough, Paul. Thank you very much. This is Heather. Yeah, just to clarify, I wasn't reading - I wasn't reading Thomas's letter as, let's say, limiting our scope but it could be an opportunity to do so if we understand that the GAC is staying out of that area. That said, I'll express a concern here. I

still have a concern - my concern is not going to go away. I'm going to have to learn to deal with it that we have two groups working in the same space.

We have two groups working on geographic names and the challenge that we have there is that we have two different definitions, if not multiple definitions, of geographic name and different policies that apply to different types of geographical name and that worries me. That's an inherent inconsistency. That creates challenges for applicants. That creates uncertainty for applicants and I worry very much about that.

I don't - it's clear to me that as much as I would like to, as much as I've asked Santa Claus, the GAC working group is not going to go away. And so that means we just have to deal with that going forward. And do our very best to clarify our scope and make it crystal clear for the community and for future applicants what names our recommendations apply to so that there's no - there are no gaps there, there's no question marks. I wouldn't like the finger pointing to come back to our group if we can - if we can avoid that.

Does anyone have any comments on this item - on the letter from Thomas or their own thoughts on this issue? Lars, I'll ask you to manage the queue for me if you would. Stunned silence, everyone's terrified. If everyone would ask Santa Claus for the GAC to quit their work then maybe we would get what we want.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here, if I can just jump in. I stepped away from the computer so I didn't put my hand up in the room. Look, I hear what you're hearing say, Heather, and I do understand the desirability to minimize the opportunities for even more confusion on this area because after all, there seems to be enough of it anyway.

But the GAC own work will proceed at a different pace to ours but because it's not in sync with our current focuses and activities it may be that it is at a mature enough point when we get to this piece of work ourselves that we can

in fact then sit down with something that is a more concrete - because what the moment what they're doing is all pretty fluffy, you know, you've got a very small group of people putting forward some potential drafting language which is yet to be discussed in any depth let alone in full within the GAC to form any sort of GAC opinion.

So I'm rather hopeful that when the time comes we will be able to negotiate some more clearly understood and perhaps mutually agreeable terminologies but that's only going to happen once their own work has proceeded to a point where they actually have some formulated definitions themselves. It's still very very early days as far as I can tell in where they are because their working group has yet to bring back substantive things for discussion.

And indeed no - as far as I can tell - substantive discussion has happened in such a way that is leading to particular outcomes or firm definitions on GAC view beyond some of the earlier resolutions. So the intent is there but the actual hard copy current view stuff doesn't seem to have been formulated yet. So Santa may still come, you never know. Just not this Christmas.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Cheryl. This is Heather. Anyone else would like to comment on this?

Paul Szyndler: Yeah, it's Paul here. I just wanted to build on what Cheryl said. Yes, it may well be Christmas 2020 but there's, from my experience, way back working in the GAC there's every likelihood that there's a possibility that this - their working group's work might sort of collapse in a heap if they don't get any traction or there isn't any momentum. So I believe that fundamentally we've done the right thing. This group has reached out to the GAC. We've reached out via the ccNSO and GNSO chairs formally and we now have a response on record. So, you know, worst case scenario we've done all we can there; now it's a case of us proceeding with our work.

And I share your fear, Heather, about we come to particular outcomes and you end up getting polar opposites from the GAC and that just doesn't help anyone. But I feel that we've done the best we can do to try to harmonize that work, we'll hope that that work goes away. And, you know, now it's basically time for us to get on with it.

And the note from Thomas is a handy full stop on that episode and hopefully he's truly able to back up the promise to bolster GAC involvement in our group as he mentioned in his letter. But we'll wait and see. Maybe that's another Christmas wish.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Paul, very much. Anyone else with a comment on this before we move on? All right, look, I appreciate the input there from Paul and Cheryl and Carlos. And agree with everything that's been said. So I will continue to ask Santa.

And there we go. So Number 4, confirm and discuss input received on three character codes. So we have received, by my records, the following comments since or since during Dublin I guess is the best way to put it. So we received some responses from the law firm Mayer Brown at Dublin on behalf of their clients. And then subsequent to that we received input - responses from law firm Partridge and Garcia from dotPL, from dotHK and from the Intellectual Property Constituency.

Does that - Lars, have I - anyone, have I missed anyone on those five?

Lars Hoffman: Sorry, Heather, can you just - so we have more than five - you're talking about the submissions so far?

Heather Forrest: Yeah, since Dublin I guess.

Lars Hoffman: Yeah, there's a number - I think five is about correct, I don't have the exact number. There's a couple of them that came through last week so I sent out this document I'm just putting up now.

Heather Forrest: Yeah. Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Lars Hoffman: On Thursday and then again today and there were a couple of CC registries that have made submissions on Friday that are not included here yet because I didn't want to deal with two different versions before the call.

Heather Forrest: No that's fine. That might be the dotHK and the dotPL because I added them to my list at the very last minute...

Bart Boswinkel: Heather, this is Bart. Heather?

Heather Forrest: Bart, yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: What I know is so just for the record for the - say we - as discussed on the previous call say Paul and Annebeth made their presentation at the ccNSO meeting and it's only after that meeting we send out the survey so we refer back to that meeting in Dublin.

Heather Forrest: Yeah, understood.

Bart Boswinkel: What I've seen now is that say after sending out the reminder last week people really start to wake up and they told me that they start looking at it and they start to submit their responses to Lars. So I will send out another reminder by the end of this week so expect more from the CC community.

Heather Forrest: Good. Good. And, Bart, thank you. Could you just remind us when we did - we've got a revised - I use the term "deadline" loosely but we have a revised sort of target for submissions.

Bart Boswinkel: Say the way I've communicated this and that is based on your communication is the 30th of November.

Heather Forrest: Good, yeah, perfect. Perfect. Good. I would anticipate that we're probably reaching the end of submissions from GNSO because that - from the GNSO community because that went out - the timing was just such that it was first notified to the GNSO a bit earlier given what Bart's described in terms of the process of how the ccNSO was approached.

And I don't know of any other comments that are forthcoming. Doesn't mean that I should know but let's say I don't know of any other comments forthcoming from the GNSO community. Nobody has said to me, you know, we have comments, can we still submit. So we'll see what we get in from the GNSO. We'll expect some more from the ccNSO if we can get it.

And then the question is what do we do with these comments? I think one thing that comes to mind for me...

Bart Boswinkel: Heather. Heather. Heather.

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Heather, just a moment. Somebody has his hand up and I know he's from ccTLD. Grigori, go ahead. Grigori, you're on mute.

Grigori Saghyan: Thank you, Bart. Do you hear me? Do you hear me?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, we can hear you.

Heather Forrest: Yes.

Grigori Saghyan: Okay. So the question is do you need any official letter from ccTLD? Or it can be some kind of recommendation or you need something with signatures or decision? Or just opinion? Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Just an opinion, Grigori. But it needs to be from the ccTLD.

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: So no official letter.

Grigori Saghyan: No, no, no ccTLD - our community, we are dotAR managers. So we can send a message that we agree...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, yeah. And send it to Lars.

Grigori Saghyan: Okay thank you.

Heather Forrest: Yeah, absolutely that's a very good question, Grigori. This is Heather. All of our work at this point is relatively informal and unofficial I suppose. So this is just the process of - it's not a formal public comment period. We're simply seeking community input in our work and we're happy to take that from any and everyone who's willing to submit it so by all means please don't worry about formal processes. It's the substance of what you have to say rather than the official nature of it that we're interested in so please by all means. And communicate that widely amongst your colleagues so that's - I wouldn't like to think that that stopped us from receiving feedback. So excellent question.

What was I saying? Oh yes, the next question is we have some - we have some time now to digest individually - digest what has come in. I confess I haven't read these last two CC submissions but will do so in the very near future. We also have some feedback that came in from the ALAC which is in a different sort of a format still. That's what I started to say.

One of the things I think maybe that's a lesson learned on this is perhaps a bit more strategizing going forward when we do seek community input in terms of how we seek community input. Perhaps we start using a form or some sort of Google docs or something that allows - that sort of pushes respondents to the best that we can into a more harmonized format of their response. Not saying that I want to influence what people say.

And I understand that sometimes form and substance go hand in hand. But we have some very different looking documents that come back and that creates some challenges for us in terms of what we do next. And now I'd appreciate some commentary on what do we do with all of this information? How do we attack this?

How do we - how do we synthesize this? How do we digest it? How do we deal with comments in such a way that I don't want to reduce them to one line because if they were reduce-able to one line then the folks who submitted these comments would have communicated in one line. And we don't want to lose valuable detail or information in somehow summarizing or paraphrasing.

So how do we deal with these comments? What process should we use to go forward? Any thoughts on that? Paul, please don't be quiet now.

Lars Hoffman: Well, Heather - oh no sorry. No sorry, I thought somebody raised their hand but hadn't. This is Lars. If you want I can make a couple of suggestions to get this going.

Heather Forrest: Please, Lars, that would be wonderful. Thank you.

Carlos Gutierrez: And then I would like to talk.

((Crosstalk))

Lars Hoffman: Oh Carlos, you want to go first? Please go ahead.

Carlos Gutierrez: No, I - sorry I have to step out of the room again. Hold a second please. I think that we should always keep in mind that we have a very good background paper and it has so much history and knowledge in it that we shouldn't lose that document so it's valuable in itself. For the record, I don't know where but I personally like the two letter code section a lot and the background that Jaap and Bart brought into it.

And we should keep the document alive, readable, with as many annexes as possible and don't worry too much about the recommendation or the positive recommendation or the conclusion for the time being, that's the point I wanted to make. Thank you very much.

Heather Forrest: Carlos, thank you. I agree 100%. In seeking community input one of the things that we can be doing is working on the front end of that section in our document which is the status quo, which is the justifications for the status quo and the background. I agree, that's something that we can very usefully be doing in the meantime while we wait for community input to come in.

Lars, over to you.

Lars Hoffman: I think Carlos covered it mostly so I have not much to say. I mean, I was just looking at the methodology obviously how we're then going to deal with the large number of comments. Bearing in mind that it will take time to go through them individually on the call but also bearing in mind that not doing that might risk overlooking some comments.

There's obviously a different possibilities of forming subgroups that individual - from the working group look at the specific comments and report back to the group. Staff could also provide summaries but that always comes with the caveat that there will be decisions to be made if you make a summary, if you include a half sentence or not and then that could be problematic if that decision is made by staff rather than by community member. So I just want to put that out there.

Carlos Gutierrez: So, Lars, probably I was not clear before. I think we - we have to bring them in as much as possible in the text - if they require changes in the text or in footnotes or making a list of the comments. And I'm ready to work together with staff on taking a look at the (unintelligible) of comments. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Okay.

Carlos Gutierrez: But always within the framework of the paper. I don't want to produce a very long list or a spreadsheet with all the comments so on. I want to bring the comments directly and see if they fit or as a footnote or as a comment or as a change in the text or recorded in the same document. I'm ready to work on the document but not produce anymore parallel documents. Sorry. Thank you very much.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. Thank you, Carlos. And I think it is a good idea that we - we end up with a lengthy document but it provides a record. I think your idea of using the appendices and appending each one of these comments that have been received actually to our work in total, I think that's a good idea because then there's absolutely no mistake that we haven't paraphrased something and done so - taking something out of context that you can go back to the original source. I think that's very appropriate and important.

So with that in mind can we, as a plan for going forward, my comments have just caught up and I want to make sure - so Susan, "Most people want to

question, I think, when they didn't do so directly. We could extract the answers from their responses. Too much work.”

I agree with what Susan has said. And I think from what I've seen in the responses by and large what we have is a yes or a no and then some reasoning for that. And what we might be able to do is group comments together, for example. We might just think about a matrix of - and I'm not suggesting another document necessarily but some sort of a matrix of on Question Number 1 we have, you know, X number of responses. They're all generally positive; they're all generally negative or whatever it is.

And try and bunch things together on the basis of reasons and drawing those out would then come into our benefits and burdens section of our document and that should help us to - if you like, see a clearer picture out of all of that. I suppose the question is how do we do that? Do we do that in small groups? Do we do that with staff's help?

My suggestion is I think we ought to individually get around these comments before we make that decision. I think between now and our next meeting if we can all get across the comments that have come in to the point of that meeting, as best is possible, there may be some come in at the last minute, as was the case for this meeting. But if we can individually get across the comments that are received immediately prior to that meeting we have an understanding of what's in those comments. I think that will then help us to understand better how to synthesize them.

My take on what we have to date as I say, is that there's a yes or a no for each question and then there's reasoning behind that. And the reasoning of course is very helpful for our justification section. But if we get a better flavor for on each of those questions are there more yeses than nos or how - is there a balance or how do we - is there any clear picture that emerges I think that would be helpful.

And then perhaps we - perhaps we come up with a methodology, a formal methodology going forward when we think about Susan's comment and Carlos's at that point. Any concerns about that or comments or responses to that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here.

Heather Forrest: Cheryl, please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Heather. No, it's not a concern, it's a suggestion. And, again, not to try and create any new documentation beyond showing community that we have heard, understood, considered and responded to their input and that's vital. That's something that was on the cards since we've done the first ATRT work many, many years ago now, community since then has an expectation, I think, of having a - some form of document which can act as an appendix.

And, I'm sorry, I can't put my hand down. Thank you. Somebody else did it for me. It's the slow Internet here in Australia.

Some form of appendix or archive-able document that shows how we have dealt with community input or in this case input from the ACs and the SOs as well. To that end I'm rather fond now of the templating type approach that's been used in first of all the CWG and now the CCWG on Accountability where it's very much a minor modification of what you were proposing, Heather, but it has a sort of a column approach, a tabular approach to dealing with the yes, nos, etceteras, and rationale.

And I would recommend perhaps Bart and Lars have a look at how we might be able to bludgeon the input we've got now into that sort of columned approach where we also then allocate it not so much to yes and no but is it supportive, is it not supportive, does to make a particular recommendation, does it say something new. And so it's sort of by that you can then - if it's something new well then you can either put it aside or say when you're going

to deal with it. If it's a yes, it's a yes. If it's a no, well so be it. And you need to look at what the rationale was.

So it's just - I think that approach might just assist and I think community is getting used to reading how a working group responds to their inputs in that sort of tool. Anyway, that's the suggestion. It's just a garnish on what you've proposed.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. Thank you, Cheryl. I think that's a useful perspective. It's one that we need to bear in mind while we've got this very let's say public-facing outreach to solicit comments, you're right, we need to close that loop and assure the public that those comments have been acknowledged and recorded and received and done something with rather than simply looking for that in the body of our document that there's something more concrete that we can do to signal you have been heard. And I think that's a valuable - it's a valuable perspective and that does weigh against the simply incorporated build it in perspective. I think it's a very valuable input.

Anyone else want to comment on that - the methodology approach? Are you generally comfortable with this idea of take another two weeks, see what we get in, digest what we have and then tackle this at our next meeting?

Paul Szyndler: Heather, it's Paul.

Heather Forrest: Yes, Paul.

Paul Szyndler: I don't want to hold the line so I'll be very brief. I agree with the approach that you've outlined and I think what we're heading towards is a typical sort of hybrid thing where we call for volunteers and have - it doesn't necessarily need to be subgroups, plural, but a subgroup of our membership who's interested in doing so that self identifies supported by staff is appropriate is probably the best way forward.

Heather Forrest: Great. Thank you, Paul. Thank you. And hopefully we will have self-identified folks and we don't have to use that horrible ICANN phrase, being voluntold to do something. That would be fantastic.

Good, anyone else concerns, comments, questions on anything relating to this? No? Hearing nothing. Any questions, concerns generally about where we are? We're at a stage of wrap up. Any other business? Anyone have anything that they would like to mention before we break the meeting?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: All good.

Heather Forrest: Marvelous. Marvelous. Wonderful. Well thank you everyone very much for your participation. Thank you for joining us. Keep an eye out on the list for any more comments as they come bearing in mind that Bart has predicted we'll have a few more CC comments come in, perhaps many more. We'll see how that works out. And we shall look forward to our next meeting in a fortnight's time.

And in the meantime all the very best for those celebrating Thanksgiving. Have a very happy one. And in fact let's just double check, does our meeting - no, our meeting does not interfere with Thanksgiving so everyone celebrating can do that, eat your turkey and do so in peace and quiet. Have a lovely two weeks, folks and we'll talk again in a fortnight. Thanks very much.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

Lars Hoffman: Thanks, Heather.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Chris). You may now stop the recordings. This concludes today's call. Thank you.

END