

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

Monday, 24 August 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.

ccNSO:

Jordi Iparraguirre, ccNSO Council NomCom appointee
Mirjana Tasic, .rs
Sanna Sahlman, .fi
Jacqueline Morris, .tt
Young-Eum Lee, .kr
Ron Sherwood .vi

GNSO

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

At-Large:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr

GAC:

ISO:

Jaap Akkerhuis

Other:

Nigel Cassimire

Apologies:

Joke Braeken, .eu
Annebeth Lange, .no
Olga Cavalli, GAC
Laura Hutchinson, .uk

ICANN staff:
Bart Boswinkel
Marika Konings

Lars Hoffman
Nathalie Peregrine

(Carlos): (The recordings) have started. Thank you.

(Richard): Thank you very much.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much (Richard). If you don't mind (Paz) I'll just do a quick roll call and then I'll hand the call over to you. Thank you ever so much.

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the CWGM (conshun) Territory Names on the 24th of August, 2015.

On the call today we have (Kaltal Vichez), (Maxima Villberm), (Vanis Thelman), Cheryl Langdon-Orr, (Jacqueline Morris), Jordi Iparraguirre, (Collin O'Brien), (Heather Forest), (Mayana Pazeek), (Susan Payne) and (Yakov Sozees).

We received apologies from (Waldo Kavaleey), (Anna Deslan), (Laura Hutchinson), (Anyia Kuglosin).

Some staff we've got (Richard Kurning), (Bob Fauswin), (Golaf Hoffman) and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all too please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you (Carlos).

(Carlos): Thank you very much, hello to everybody. Special thanks for the people who woke up so early this morning. And let me start by looking at the agenda that we have. We had a rather short call last time that call to senior chair.

At that call we went over the document that we had completed by that time that was patiently with two letter code (traction). It was a very useful exercise to get the whole history together. And it was (two) weeks ago. And I haven't heard anything. And I issue any more so the first question to the group is if we can (set) the question that is of the (catchum ampilliary codes) and (preview). And (give it a shot) so we can continue on (tremedical chamange) for the time being.

Of course there will be an opportunity to go back to the document when we have attended the complete document. So I would like to ask in the room if there are any comments on that document. For reference I have asked the RFC to specify the (facts) of each document we are referring to and (being) to the version that we have on the screen and you'll see (a large) between version May 1. EB edits (bleem). Is that right?

Lars Hoffman: (Carlos), (Sanjay), this is Lars. The version - I have a (promise, Maycia, memory I'm sorry I can't) actually see what's on the screen right now. The version that you should have up has the date on from first of May. But it's been actually updated since so it should say 22nd so it's the version that I sent out to the group on the 22nd of June. And that should be in the (AC) right now.

(Carlos): Okay. I have sometimes my doubts on how we can reference all documents that (they) created (now) but were sent out to be in an email from Lars and they can then I guess - they will be referenced in the (weekly) somewhere. We'll try to pin it down for directive. Any questions in the room and should WECANN (preach) the two-letter co-discussion for the time being and assume that these documents is a consensus document out of the working group and should be part of the final document?

I hear no comments. If that's so I would like to continue then with the agenda.

A few weeks ago (Scott Thesi) did (leave) a question there on the (pre letter coats). Question there is, is there any place to make a (false) because it speaks of what methodology we should follow; which is a big step. I think the two-letter codes was not a methodology, it was just a (lift). We have the whole explanation of why the (lift) may be (within the rule).

On the three- letter codes we have developed a few options. It is continually (on) the list, the list of three-letter codes or developed from rules which are more general than just using a list. Or (unintelligible) it is (understood).

Lars Hoffman: This is (Carlos) or sorry (Carlos) this is Lars. I'm trying to get back into the (AC) and I will ask not to (lead to present), just give me one second.

(Carlos): No problem. We have developed (six) options along the longs first to be tipping the occupational myth and then we were also (going) to three-letter codes. Then opening a little bit up the three-letter codes, as long as you are not in conflict with the list and then opening furthermore on the options as long as there are no similarities up to this open-up the use of three-letter codes.

And we have had some very interesting comments. (Ray) put this (version) of the (unintelligible). And we have a range of options. I would comment again your committee discussion. The first question I would put forward is if we are going to stick the (a limp) or if they are going to develop some rules or a framework or a methodology as per the (charging).

The second issue that I see is the general comment of the list is that we are still stuck with just one (myth), the Iceland (myth). And only in the process of comments we have heard about other lists - at least I have heard about the

(national a list - the national that was) referred to as (source) for cultural and (elliptical) regions.

And a third comment is that a few people have said that we just (pull) up the list altogether and stay (late) basically and let the market decide. And the last comment I would put forward is how do we deal with the (unintelligible) and major (lines) that I see. I'd like to open up for all comments how we proceed with the three-letter codes.

((Crosstalk))

(Carlos): A letter (Foresht Leash).

Jordi Iparraguirre: Good morning, (Carlos). Thank you very much. Hello everyone. I am - I appreciate (Carlos)'s summary of the comments received to-date. And it seems we have a fairly broad range of views.

One of the things (ast toast) that we need to note as we transition to this issue of three-letter codes is that we don't have, if you like, I had - perhaps so much use or tradition. But we don't have the existing practice is - that's probably the right phrase to use. We don't have the existing practice of reserving three-letter codes on the basis of a single standard as (Carlos) has noted.

And that creates challenges then, given that our rationale for the conclusions that we've come to in relation to two-letter codes were based on exactly that - based on existing practice and adoption of an external standard. I think we want to bear in mind the comments that were raised in relation to two-letter codes.

IANA has a long standing tradition of not wanting to determine what is a reason on a country - that at least encourages me - and I would expect encourages many given the force of the comments in relation to two-letter

codes away from drafting a new list from an ICANN -developed (assuming) generous definition of what is a country or territory.

With that in mind I would suggest that we direct our attention to existing standards, not just lists but standards to (bring up) on us the (referenced) that (YAK) had encouraged us to use in relation to the ISO 3166 list but it's not list for standard. I would direct our attention to that.

If you we had existing standards in use, in environments outside of ICANN to represent these things then that's a good place to start. But I would hesitate for ICANN to be attempting to adopt its own definition. Thank you.

(Carlos): Hello, can you hear me?

Nathalie Peregrine: Yes, (Carlos), I can hear you.

(Carlos): Yes, thank you. Just Nathalie was asking me to check my audio. Thank you Jordi for the explanation about the list. If there is no comment to (assume) (Heather)'s commentary right now it might be you go one step further and very specific comments that people have made.

And I think it was (Colin O'Brien) and (Roman Malinofsky) from Poland that they have mentioned that there is already another type of precedent. And these types of precedents is the delegation of the (two letter code) of second metal where we have opened the possibility to (governments) to be their (abuse).

If it's (even likely) that should be either more or less and I see that (these) people that may commence the three-letter codes open up a window, it should be going to a (round box). Wider consultation I would say and should we ask if - I don't know ask (who) - who to ask. Is if some three-letter code should be (withheld) as a reserve. And I just want to also record that

comment, that specific comment about the (denta) phases because I see a precedent already at the second level.

Although that's not our target in the working group, we're working on the, at the first level is obviously the possibility they are taking government (fee) come up to the situation and ask why you don't ask government that again, today, we don't have the (unintelligible) without year-to-date that was (fitted) in line.

Thank you very much for helping me (out). (Jeff) can you hear me? You have raised your hand - yes.

(Jeff): Yes absolutely - I had problem with my system, that's why I couldn't react earlier. So, yes. I hope you can hear me now, hopefully.

(Carlos): Very well, (Jeff), thank you.

(Jeff): Just one comment I wanted to make for a start with Jordi's (unintelligible) comment. And what we probably should do is see what current practice is. Because and really write it down because it is somewhat confusing. And I mean it's - if you look at some people may be as well. If you look at how it's done currently it's kind of a mixed bag of traditional, meaning the (dot com) for example.

And there are some rules in the guidebook that I'm not really sure - and today refer to 3166 but if you really look closely even the last gTLDs is not really following those rules. Things like XYZ should actually be disallowed according to the guidebook.

So maybe it would be good to have a proper look at what is there. What is already there and whether inconsistencies are. On the subject of (honor) standards, there are an awful lot - mean (unintelligible) there are so many you can choose from. And before I end - play (unintelligible) is bit of a challenge.

And you find standards from the 6040 thing; the Olympic committee has (unintelligible) codes which slightly difference from the (fee from stammut) of the three-character codes. There is the NATO three-character codes which kind of follows the ISO but not completely.

And with ICANN if you want I can send complete list for the (unintelligible) of that. But you have to wonder yet if you use all of them you should (unintelligible) that you're being consistent. And so you have to watch what you're - where you're - which (statements) you look at.

(Carlos): Thank you (Jeff). Heather, would you like to comment?

Heather Peregrine: Thank you (Carlos). Thank you, (Jeff), for your comments. I at this stage my thinking is I would like for us, if it's possible, I'm not sure what the mechanisms are. And given that cross-community working groups are still a relatively new beast within the ICANN community I would feel more comfortable if we had some community input to the extent there's a mechanism to do that on our approach to two-letter codes before we go too far down in relation to three-letter codes.

I'm not suggesting that we halt and down tools, but I would appreciate having some voter feedback from outside of this group before we apply that rationale or try and develop a new rationale in relation to three-letter codes. Thank you.

(Carlos): Thank you Heather. If there are no other comments then let me comment. I fully understand your recommendation and as I said at the beginning, we have done pretty good work on the two-letter codes. And we should bring it as soon as possible. But to comment (unintelligible) everybody, I hate to say that on the other hand there is some of the commenters have mentioned there is already a wide open (practice) in three-letter codes.

And it remains and there are other discussions on - which I think are very important which is the linguistic issue. We have assigned three-letter codes to some linguistic areas, not (from) a political areas like (Thesselonia); which they are (trying) hard.

And we face these questions of the IDNs and I - so I (sold) your (unintelligible) Buenos Aires meeting (for) the impact there that the different countries have in terms of having multiple languages. And I worry that we stop this process and we cannot continue discussing, not based on geography and political entities that we made not enough progress on linguistical, cultural and IDN issues.

That will be my only commentary to this (unintelligible) or what you just said, Heather. And I give back to (Jaylup).

(Jaylup): I actually show - what a really - given that's already quite (strong) things and on and not on; having some idea what current goals are and are the current policy of whatever is - even if it is most inconsistence, to write it down first and then turn over. It would help if the (boo stayed out) maybe whether inconsistencies are, I think.

And then it's much easier to ask the rest of the community which direction should go to. Because else we keep circling around the inconsistencies without (staffing), it's really narrowed it down. I mean let's take first the (incentery). I mean some things are not clear. What people don't realize and know is for instance that there are also research three-letter codes, at least according to ISO 3166.

And so they might or might not play role.

(Carlos): Thank you (Jaylup). I want to comment. I want to take my co-chair hat away and make a comment to Heather's proposal of making a consultation on the (unintelligible).

I would be ready to do that as long as we are fluid in this document is some kind of recommendation for the IDN. And then if we say okay, this is the world and it's a two-letter code world; the first level. And it is solid and it has a long tradition. And for that we assume it should be the main like this, independency of what happens with three, two-letter codes; the names that we all would recommend to the (unintelligible).

They could go forward with the IDNs in terms of three-letter codes. With that I would feel good about going into the conversation, but the way it is presented now just the facts and the tradition on (jay frank, the consultation) I would hate to say I think there will be losing the art of precious time in terms of what's - over (despite of the old); which are starting to test the IDNs Honor. SO IDNs honor.

I do - I think we need at least in for the IDNs we need to take a (position) and then I will consider it, recommended going for that consultation unless that is close and say, okay, we stopped our (charger inter-medical) but then we have to add a few things to the document; inconsistencies as we have said and from my point of view a position or a recommendation whether IDNs should be above. Thank you.

(Carlos): (Bart) please go ahead.

Bart Boswinkel: (Carlos), could you explain what you consider the issues around IDNs. If you go back to the - sorry - if you go back to the study group and the study group reports. There is - say and if you look at the definition at least or the potential for overlap between the use of country and territory names in the local languages or IDNs.

I agree it's quite an issue. But say comparing those currently with the three-letter codes and standards is a bit; oh I think it's putting something in this phase of the project which needs to be addressed at a later stage. Because if

you talk about three-letter codes etc., there's already the assumption of (asking).

(Carlos): Yes thank you. Maybe I wasn't clear enough but what I mean is I would strongly recommend to countries working on IDNs to reserve two-letter codes, only. And don't worry about three-letter codes. Let the three-letter codes out of (disculp) and say we - I don't know how to spell it out or if it makes sense but I would say we recommend ccTLDs or registrars working with other's (scripts) to limit, to reserve only two-letter codes for countries and directories.

I didn't mean to expand the horizon but just to be that clear sense of direction that we recommend only two-letter codes to be reserved for the...

((Crosstalk))

(Carlos): I don't know if that answers your question Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: It does. But because say - what effectively you're saying is that the ccNSO needs to revisit its overall policy for the selection of IDNs.

(Carlos): Oh, I think it's urgent, yes. I think that...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: In the sense of if you look at the overall policy which is recommended it talks about a meaningful representation of the name of the country in a local language. And not being a- and not using a non-Latin script. It's a bit more subtle than this. And for reasons of practicality we could not - it was not restricted to two-letter codes because they sometimes are confusingly similar to existing two-letters in the ISO 3166 code already.

And what you see - there are some IDN ccTLDs with three - at least three letter codes - all three letters.

(Carlos): Thank you for the explanation and it might be an inconsistency under the (ops) definition but then let's test the inconsistency. And ask you will recommend two-letter codes in other (scripts) we recommend two to three-letter codes. And see what the implications of this is. But I really don't want to - I understand Heather's recommendation. I think it makes a lot of sense. It will freeze the two-letter codes of the ISO list but unless there is a way to do it pretty fast, the only worry I have about this procedure is on the IDN side.

If that helps to explain my position? Heather I don't know if you want to comment on that? I can accept any critique.

Heather Perregrine: (Carlos), this is Heather. No I think - I don't disagree with what you said. My concern is simply that in the current environment, look, I had this concern with the study group as well. There's a few of us that really care about this issue enough to put the time into it at participating in this group. And yet when it comes to making decisions suddenly the entire ICANN community is interested in this.

They're not interested in phone calls every two weeks and the level of effort that we've put in. But there is finger-pointing when decisions get made. And we didn't have that stress with the study group because we really weren't there as such to make decisions. Given the sensitivity of this for all of the reasons that you identified (Carlos), these other interests that exist in relation to three-letter codes that perhaps don't exist in relation to two-letter codes.

I really would like to take some community guidance on this. I'd like to take the pulse of the community. I'd like to know where we are now. I agree wholeheartedly with (Jeff) and indeed that's what our options paper says, status quo, what is the status quo? We need to know that before we move forward. Let's take the time to do that.

So perhaps what we did here is to not stop our work, to be able to progress. Let's polish up what we have in relation to two-letter codes. It seems to me that this group is fairly comfortable. There was certainly nothing - no comments raised in opposition with what we've done in relation to two-letter codes.

Let's put that out, let's ask the community, you know, not just to focus on the conclusion but to focus on the methodology; how we go in to where we are now. In the meantime we then work on capturing, articulating, writing down the status quo on three-letter codes. So when we have the community's feedback on two, we then turn around and say thanks very much, we make whatever adjustments we need to and here's where we are on three-letter codes.

And then there's already that existing dialogue with the community, if you like. And as a sign of good-faith that after 18 months this group has come to something. And here's what we'd like to do going forward. So I don't disagree with you (Carlos). Thank you.

(Carlos): Thank you Heather. I would like to go back to staff. Could we - would this be the kind of report that goes to open commence or is this a preliminary report or is there a final report on that section of the chart. Or do you need to - I don't know. We're splitting the charter in two or do you think Lars that we have enough material to come up with the final suggestion?

Lars? Please (go ahead).

Lars Hoffman: Thank you (Carlos). This is Lars for the record. Now what I would suggest is something we do in GNSO working groups is send out just a request for input to the SOACs and also to the GNSOs - stakeholder groups (unintelligible). And just tell them, look we are working - usually we work the (charter) to those groups. So we concern here, I don't see a reason why we couldn't just

take a part of the chart out and say we're working on this part of the chart at the moment. And before we dive into the substance we'd just like to gauge your take on this issue.

And we can even include (which one) specific questions that we'd like them to answer. Or just have an open call for comment. And that could go out and would require to set a deadline and obviously the responses are voluntary. But experience shows that you really get a decent return on investment.

(Carlos): Can you repeat the last sentence please, Lars? Experience shows that?

Lars Hoffman: Oh that the return rate of answers is - you get a good return of investment. So there's - not everybody will replay but there's normally a fair amount of diverse responses.

(Carlos): Bart please?

Bart Boswinkel: Say from a seasonal perspective we've said the working group has all the flexibility it needs. So there is either - say it's the preference and up to the working group how they want to solicit comments, as long as it's communicated properly to the community.

(Carlos): Thank you Bart. Lars, do you want to comment please?

Lars Hoffman: Yes. Just to add to what Bart just said. Obviously we're for example usually this kind of a request (deemed) on the GNSO we just contact the ccNSO as such and then it's up to them to distribute because we have obviously hit the joint group so - and naturally we don't ask for a response from the ccNSO. We wish, you know, after this on (percy do) with the opposite paper from any member that's teaching to serve, they wish to responds. So it should be as diverse and open as possible.

(Carlos): Okay, yes, I see another tactical advantage in proceeding like this, with some risks. For me it includes the assumption that we're going to proceed independently of GAC. And I would almost welcome to proceed independently of GAC. But I don't know if that affects this consultation process.

And we have spent (nearly) six months or longer trying to get closer to GAC without any response. And moving ahead without their participation and so on might be a bold step. But I would take to increase (wood back fire). Please Heather.

Heather Peregrine: Thanks (Carlos). I just wanted to make a bit of a comment, a (spix) on our agenda. But one of the action items that came out of Buenos Aires was the result of a request that we made of the chairs of the ccNSO and GNSO (Byran) and (Jonathan) to put their heads together and see if they couldn't communicate directly with the chair (big ax) to encourage communications between the two groups.

And I understand that there is a communications that's in progress that that should be sent out in the very near future. Now I think (Carlos) I'll perhaps read your mind a little bit and say I don't know how personally I feel useful that that's going to be. Whether it's going to change what's currently happening.

However, that is certainly in (train). I would like to think that that's communication would be out before - well before Dublin. Whether that changes the working relationship between the two groups; and I don't really mean our working relationship in terms of openness to the GAC, I mean the other way around. I won't hold my breath.

However, we have done everything that we can to try and facilitate that relationship. Thank you.

(Carlos): Thank you very much. Okay. I think it makes sense Heather; nevertheless we are meeting the two co-chairs from the GNSO so I would suggest that we wrap up your recommendation and submit it to review by the two ccNSO co-chairs.

I myself would like to go back their (unintelligible) of May 1 or June 22 after we check that they will be complete, that it is not out of context. And I would suggest that we take in addition with the group in two weeks. What do you think Heather?

Heather Peregrine: (Carlos), I'm happy to support that approach. I think that's a good way to go forward.

(Carlos): I would like to see if somebody else in the room wants to comment on this last bit.

Lars Hoffman: Thank you (Carlos), this is Lars. I'm just wondering on the feedback and checking with the ccNSO co-chairs, should we send a note to the list and then several of us to discuss and see if there's any objections. And then we can proceed. Because we can (pre-prepare) if everybody's okay, we can prepare the letter within a couple of days and then send to the group for review.

And then send it out as soon as possible. It's up to you. We don't have to wait two weeks for that. I think it's something we can do on the list.

(Carlos): No, exactly. I see the two weeks just to review and ask the questions and so on. And in two weeks say yes, let's go ahead. But that requires sending the letter to the group, I agree with you. I would request a call with the co-chairs to explain this very clearly and get their support.

And I would use the two weeks to also review your document. If anybody in the group wants to make a comment to this document that is going to go for this consultation they should do it before the next call in two weeks. And then

in two weeks we have all the elements and we just flag - green flag we go ahead.

I don't want to have a discussion in two weeks. I just want to have everything ready - the letter out, the call with my co-chairs and some time for myself to look at the document. If that's okay? Heather is this in your hands?

Heather Peregrine: (Carlos) that's fine with me. Yes. I think it's a good idea to - for those who aren't on this call because there are some folks missing on this call that are normally with use. I think it's helpful that they have a chance to at least approve the idea of what we're proposing here. That we're going to take this out to the community.

We give everyone a chance to - just picking up on my email that I sent 12 hours or so ago saying, you know, this doesn't foreclose your comment on the document. Let's put some time around that and say, look, if you'd like to comment within the next two weeks please do so. We plan for this to go out to the community. If not go ahead and comment after it goes out to the community and let's get this out and show that we've done some progress - have made some progress and move on.

So I'm happy with what's being proposed.

(Carlos): Okay. This is I think very consistent with what you just said. Lars, would you agree? We will prepare the letter in the house with the whole group and proceed like that.

Lars Hoffman: Yes it sounds good (Carlos).

(Carlos): Okay. Thank you. I would like to remind that also on the last call of who weren't all there, all the co-chairs and it's got a rather short. It was okayed two weeks ago and I don't want to procrastinate with this issue. But I think it's a very reasonable way to proceed.

If that's all - Point 4 of the agenda - it means that the comments on the three-letter codes are not wasted. We're going to continue to discuss the three-letter codes. I think we have to consolidate the really big recommends. I made up first, attempts to consolidate the major messages. I will draft them and send them to Lars this week.

We can put that together so we don't lose track of the comments for a specific date. If somebody else wants to make a comment on Point 4 of the agenda on the three-letter codes that I propose, go ahead. If not I will continue then with the last point of the agenda. And that's we're only months away from meeting face-to-face.

I guess we do have a face-to-face meeting of the working group in Dublin. I would expect that...

((Crosstalk))

Lars Hoffman: (Carlos), this is Lars.

(Carlos): ...meet Monday at the usual time. Lars? Can you give you that spot guarantee?

Lars Hoffman: Sorry (Carlos). I've got problems with my connections tonight. I can't raise my arm and I will (unintelligible) an image.

And so yes, for Dublin, we just want to confirm that the group is wanting to meet face-to-face and exactly as you said I would suggest that the Monday time slot that we had at the last meeting as well, I think that worked well.

But I'll suggest - I'll send a little note to the mailing list to see if anybody objects and then we'll put in the request and then we'll hopefully get the slot again.

(Carlos): Now when I found you I was held in a limbo between the comments in the two-letter codes chapter and the three-letter codes. As you know, exactly what the agenda would be. Heather if you want to comment on that?

Heather Peregrine: Apologies (Carlos). I was typing a comment in the Chat to - remarks about the meeting. Tell me again, ask me again?

(Carlos): If we filled out the first chapter, the two-letter code chapter for comments, depending on the time limit we put we might find ourselves in Dublin between finishing the comment period on two-letter codes and that's knowing if you are going to continue with the three-letter codes or not. So I'm a little bit worried what the agenda will be if (at the head-to-head) committee.

Heather Peregrine: Fair enough. Look, I think face-to-face meetings in the past, I found the face-to-face meetings most valuable in a sense that it's - when we're around the room we're a bit more open with our comments. I think there are folks that put things into the Chat that perhaps aren't keen to speak up in a 40 minute call.

I've just found that, you know, in a history of this group that we get quite solid input when we have face-to-face. And I think it also gives an opportunity for the local internet community in that geographical region where we're meeting - folks who aren't on this call to join us and to hear what we're doing.

So rather than lose the visibility I think - and particularly given that we'll have public comment out to the extent that we want to have that transparency and accountability; which I always think is a good thing in terms of the community, let's put ourselves in front of the community.

And if we don't need the 90 minutes, that's fine. We don't need the 90 minutes. But I'd rather have it there than not. And apologies - I have to - I have an early morning lecture this morning. So I'm going to have to drop off.

But I appreciate the opportunity to give input in the call and will look forward to hearing from everyone on the list. Thanks.

(Carlos): Thank you very much Heather. Good luck with your lecture.

Okay, for everybody else I mean this is a great improvement. The last call was only 30 minutes; this one has increased by 15 minutes. We still don't have the co-chairs of the ccNSO, that's a pity. We still don't have but I don't want to spend your time anymore unless somebody has an additional comment to make.

You heard Lars will prepare a letter that will go very soon out to the group. And hoping that by in two weeks everybody will have agreed to this proposed documentation on the two-letter codes. And we will hand it out very soon after the next meeting.

So last call - if there aren't any comments I really want to thank the people who makes comments to either three--letter codes - we will prepare the summary for the next meeting also. And thank you very much.

Heather Peregrine: Bye.

Lars Hoffman: Thanks (Carlos), by everyone.

(Carlos): Thank you Lars, thank you everybody.

Group: Bye-bye.

Coordinator: Thank you very much (Richard). That concludes today's call. You may now stop the recording.

END