ICANN Transcription
Cross-Community WG on Use of Country/Territory Names as TLDs
Monday, 29 August 2016 at 2100 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Cross-Community WG on Use of Country/Territory Names as TLDs on the Monday, 29 August 2016 at 21:00 UTC. 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. Attendance may be also found at:
https://community.icann.org/x/_w_sAw
The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-cwg-ctn-29aug16-en.mp3

Attendees:

ccNSO:
Annebeth Lange, .no
Timo Vohmar, .ee

GNSO
Heather Forrest, IPC (co-Chair)
Alexander Schubert, RySG
Colin O'Brien, IPC
Robin Gross, NCSG
Griffin Barnett, IPC
Maxim Alzoba, NTAG (GNSO)
Susan Payne, NTAG (GNSO)

ALAC:
Cheryl Langdon-Orr

GAC:
Milagros Castanon Seoane
Nigel Cassimire
Panagiotis Papaspiliopoulos

Additional Members:
Jaap Akkerhuis (ISO 3166 Expert)

Apologies:
Carlos Raul Gutierrez, NPOC (co-Chair)
Ron Sherwood, .vi
Sanna Sahlman, .fi
Paul Szyndler (co-Chair), .au
Laura Watkins, .uk (ccNSO)

ICANN staff:
Bart Boswinkel
Marika Konings
Emily Barabas
Joke Braeken
Michelle DeSmyter

Michelle DeSmyter: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening again. Welcome to the CWG UCTN meeting on the 29th of August at 2100 UTC.

On the call today we do have Alexander Schubert, Annebeth Lange, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Colin O'Brien, Griffin Barnett, Heather Forrest, Jaap Akkerhuis, Maxim Alzoba, Nigel Cassimire, Susan Payne, Timo Vöhmar. And we do have apologies from Laura Watkins, Paul Szyndler, Carlos Raul Gutierrez, Sanna Sahlman and Ron Sherwood.

From ICANN staff today we have Joke Braeken, Marika Konings, Bart Boswinkel, Emily Barabas, and myself, Michelle DeSmyter.

I would like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And I'll turn the call back over to you, Heather. Thank you, you may continue.

Heather Forrest: Excellent. Thank you, Michelle, very, very much. And in that delay I actually probably served us well because we discovered that I couldn't hear anyone so I was wondering about. And I can see we've also had Annebeth Lange join us at least on the Adobe and I note her request in the chat for a dial-out.

Quickly to summarize to make sure that it gets captured on the recording and that I impertinently jumped ahead, this is our first meeting since Helsinki, since our face to face meeting in Helsinki. And strictly speaking we didn't meet as a CWG in our normal style during the new style policy forum or Meeting B. We held a – or hosted a – or sat in the background in a, I'm not sure how we want to describe it – in a cross community forum on the broader topic of geographic names and their protection and recognition in the DNS, their use in the DNS.

And we sat in the audience and listened to some very varied input on the question that indeed sits at the heart of our charter, which is is it possible to achieve a harmonized framework on not only the subject matter that is the topic of our charter, which is country and territory names, but the broader question of geographic names; is it possible to achieve a harmonized framework? And we had the benefit of data – instant data in the room in the form of a poll in the Adobe room that was given to us as part of that forum.

And found that we ran I think by the end something like 50% of the room saying, yes it was possible or potentially possible and 50% of the room saying no, they didn't think it was possible. Please don't quote me on that numbers, that's a very, very rough – very, very rough summary.

But broadly speaking, let's say, there wasn't overwhelming support by the end of the session. And I noted with some interest that the answers, let's say, in favor or thinking that a harmonized framework were possible, went down as the session progressed, which was fairly interesting. So there we are.

With that in mind and we came home, our European colleagues had some summer holidays and the cochairs and staff gave it some thought and staff volunteered to put together this draft progress report on our work. I think it's a very timely position at which we take stock of where we are. We reflect on what we've learned from that – from that cross community policy forum experience and we perhaps seek some input from either the chartering

organizations that were involved in the formation of this cross community working group or the community at large.

So with that, that explains the genesis of this progress report. Much thanks and I'm pleased to see that that was acknowledged on the list as well to Joke Braeken. Very unfortunately we had a shift of GNSO support staff in the middle of the summer with a medical emergency and have been very fortunate to have Emily Barabas step into the shoes of Steve Chan in the time of Steve's medical absence. So with that in mind, the entire task fell on Joke to put together this draft and we're very grateful to her for having done that.

I submitted some comments on the list to the draft and Annebeth raised some questions. You can see that version here. And, Joke, could you confirm for us, is this – does this draft encapsulate all of the comments received to date? Or is this just let's say Annebeth's response to my draft?

Joke Braeken: Hi, Heather. This is Joke speaking. So this is indeed the version that addresses all comments that have been received to date. Some formatting has been accepted but the additions have been left as track changes.

Heather Forrest: Perfect. Thank you, Joke, very much. And Susan's comments are incorporated as well, that's fantastic, Susan Payne, that's wonderful. Excellent. Thank you very much. And perhaps it would be helpful, Joke, as the author of the first draft of the progress report I'll put you on the spot for a second, are you willing to say a few words about what was in your head as you put together the first draft?

Joke Braeken: Sure. I'm happy to do so. This is Joke speaking. So this table was indeed requested as Heather already stated by the CWG cochairs. And it lays actually out the group's discussion to date and provides the working group's conclusions and recommendations so actually a basis for the conclusions and recommendations in relation to the group's main objective.

So we first started off with describing the scope and the objective of this working group and then going over to the group's discussions to date starting with the two-letter representations of country and territory names and then going over to three-letter representations and then moving towards the end of the document regarding the cross community session that was held in Helsinki, concluding with some comments and observations and providing a draft recommendation.

So this document was extensively commented by both cochairs and participants in this working group. And the version that you see on your screen right now reflects those comments that have been received to date.

Over to you, Heather. Is there anything else that I can add?

Heather Forrest: (Unintelligible), Joke, thank you very much, very, very helpful. What I'd like to do now is turn it over to the participants of the meeting. Would anyone like to comment on this draft perhaps who hasn't had – and indeed Annebeth notes that there has been some discussion on the list. We need to try and capture that discussion to the extent that discussion brings about changes to the draft.

At this stage, but, hey, we need to try and incorporate that discussion into the draft and not just have a separate sidebar discussion. So perhaps if anyone would like to – Annebeth or Susan, if you want to say any comments about your changes or if anyone hasn't had an opportunity to make some comments directly into the draft now would be a good time to do that. So I turn the floor open and ask if anyone would like to raise any comments. I see we have a few people typing. Susan, please, go right ahead.

Susan Payne: Yes, hello. Hi. It's Susan Payne here. Yes, I – most of my comments – none of my comments are really substantive, I don't think. But I think the issue that has sparked the discussion on the list relates to the kind of recommendations

where I know in the version, as you commented and added some additional wording, have a – you'd made some specific recommendations or was suggesting sort of specific recommendations as to if this working group considers that it can't really go any further with its work who should pick up this work.

And I had agreed that I do feel that we should be recommending that it goes into the policy development process on subsequent procedures, which is already underway and which is tasked with dealing with these issues and will be dealing with other, you know, the issue of other geographic names which are not country and territory names and indeed will be also having within the scope of its work other sort of culturally sensitive names, for want of a better word.

And so it seems to me in – very sensible that the conversation about the three letter terms and country names ought to be held in the same place and at the same time. But that's where the debate on the list has really come because, you know, that isn't something that I think everyone agrees with.

Heather Forrest: Susan, thanks very much for your comments. I agree. I agree that that's – I think that's a very helpful summary of where the comments on the list went to and perhaps we've gotten lots of them now that you can scroll through. If we turn then to the area marked at the end recommendations. My concern, I mean, it's helpful if I articulate the rationale for my additions to that part of the document.

My concerns are that we really are in the best possible position to give recommendations as to what happens next in this group and I think we could do a bit more in this document to clarify exactly what our position on that is. I've had some concerns from the beginning the fact that we were set up as a CWG this is a helpful thing in some sense, and of course a fairly sensible recommendation coming out of the ccNSO study group that this group was

essentially formed from or as a result of but the CWG has an uncertain form in terms of policy development.

And it's seemed clear, and we've mentioned it a few times throughout our work and – that any recommendations or conclusions that we came to would inform a policy development process but it wasn't really clear, let's say, that we have any policy development authority ourselves. And indeed, let's say, under the bylaws we don't.

Annebeth, please.

Annebeth Lange: Hi, Heather. Hi, all. Can you hear me now? Can you hear me?

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, very clear, Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, okay. Fine. I agree with Heather, even if we have tried quite a long time to find a way through the CWG it's been very difficult to find our way forward. And in any case, we would have to give the results of this work to the PDP in the end. So even if it's not totally agreed on, I think that I have a certain impression that there might be perhaps best to transfer the debate to GNSO policy development process because the discussions on this topic in the CWG has, and beyond, have proven so difficult.

But we should be mindful that the debate has to be cross community and that the decisions of only one segment of it will not be accepted without debate by other SOs, ACs. If that process does not guarantee a fair thing and participation, united decision making, to all interested parts in the community so perhaps it should be made clear in the recommendation conclusions adding something and avoid any wording that could – would limit such a dialogue to the remit of the GNSO PDP on subsequent procedures that is this

may be the most suitable policy forum, but it doesn't exhaustively cover all the interested parts of the community.

And definitely as specific and close engagement with the ccNSO and the GAC and other stakeholders. We need that as well. So I hope this could – we could agree on going forward in a way that we get a result in the end. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Annebeth, very much. Cheryl, please, your hand.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Hopefully you can hear me well, I'm in a car on a mobile phone. I want to just reinforce what Annebeth has just said, and I'm speaking as a active participant in that aforementioned GNSO Subsequent Procedures Working Group.

There is clearly a, in my view, specific need for a carefully balanced set of interests to be looking at these very important issues. I am not suggesting that there is an unnecessary or even unsurprising bias toward particular industry interests in the makeup of a GNSO PDP process, but we do need to remember that the focus is there on the constituent parts of the GNSO and their particular interests and counterbalances of interests that does result in some of the advice and discussions that need to happen on this topic I think being perhaps less equitably balanced at any table that we form in just a pure GNSO PDP construct. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Cheryl, very much. And helpful to have contributions at this stage from someone involved in the Subsequent Procedures PDP, thanks. And some of us here on the list are – myself and I know quite a few others, that's helpful. So I think from my perspective, let's say, coming from the GNSO I certainly don't represent one of the contracted parties in the GNSO so I am to a certain degree sensitive to these concerns, let's say, about the challenge of representation in a PDP.

And that said, certainly the bylaws and the charters of PDP working groups are set up to enable the entire community to participate. And it's certainly an inclusive environment in its construct. I think where PDPs have fallen down is that certain communities, certain, let's say, groups in the community don't participate or aren't able to participate as much as they might like to do. That might be a workload issue.

And indeed I think that's something that this CWG has suffered from in a sense that we've had the unfortunate position of the better part of our existence competing with IANA transition. And I know that resources are stretched thin for a number of participants, and I note Robin's comments in the chat that ALAC members were some of the most active during the PDP. And that's very, very helpful.

I suppose that that, you know, is good evidence, let's say, of the journey that we've already traveled to get here which is the Applicant Guidebook and the attempt by the community to come to agreement on some quite frankly very challenging points.

And indeed Cheryl makes a comment about motivation. So, look, I think we've been a bit unfortunate with this CWG and that at times certain portions of the community have been able to participate in our work and at other times less able to participate in our work.

I don't think the PDP – speaking personally – I don't think the PDP suffers from any sort of institutional bias or structural bias; I think the reality is that different members of the community are interested in different things and have competing interests and competing obligations on their time and flagging motivation and varying workloads and this sort of thing.

So I don't fundamentally think there's a problem institutionally with the PDP to the extent that there were, I think we have a very serious problem on our hands. And so I'm – let's say I feel confident that that's not the case.

I suppose the thing that I think in the back of my mind about that PDP, having looked very, very carefully at its charter and we did – I felt that it was important to disclose, if you like, that in this progress report. The cochairs of this CWG did meet with one of the cochairs of Subsequent Procedures PDP in Helsinki. And it wasn't, let's say, easy to achieve that meeting given the rather full nature of the schedule in Helsinki.

And for that reason we were only able to meet with one of the cochairs of the PDP, Jeff Neuman and not Avri Doria as well. I'm – to discuss the charter in my mind, another of our critical flaws, in addition to being a CWG that doesn't have policy making authority, another one of our flaws has been our fairly limited charter.

And I don't think that that really came to light to me ironically even after having spent quite a bit of time some years participating in the ccNSO study group that preceded this, it seems to me that we're inherently set up to fail in this business of achieving a harmonized framework in that we're only given the mandate of dealing with country and territory names. And the broader question is so much larger which is why we open it up in our policy forum cross community session to try and capture views on the broader part of the community.

So you'll see that a number of my tweaks here in the document reflect that or emphasize that point that the problem with achieving a harmonized framework is we can only achieve a harmonized framework on a very discrete point here and that raises particular challenges.

Would anyone else like to comment on the – on, let's say, I suppose, we're discussing the conclusion and recommendations. Annebeth, please.

Annebeth Lange: Hi, again. I just wanted to say a few words about the participation in a GNSO PDP. I think that one of the reasons why it's difficult for other stakeholders to

feel that the work in another stakeholder's PDP is kind of a foreign territory, if you see what I mean. That they are kind of (unintelligible), that they don't belong properly and even if they are there it's another stakeholder group's PDP. And it's difficult to get through with their views. And they don't know the other people the same way as they do in their own stakeholder group.

It's just a theory from my point of view, but that might be one of the problems, why they are not participating probably, a lot of us, during the PDP. If we look back at the last round of the gTLDs, a lot of the comments came after the last result of the PDP and then all the discussions started and all – especially the GAC came with a lot of things and input and it takes a long time. And I'm so afraid that we end up this time as well that we don't get all the views while we are working and then it stops up afterwards.

So how can we do it in a good way to work even better together and get a result?

Heather Forrest: Annebeth, thank you very much. I'd like to comment on your – or perhaps ask some of your questions but Bart has his hand up so we'll turn to Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, just say two – say two observations as a staff person being involved in this working group and in the study group and with the ccNSO background. And they are first around the limited framework.

Say, the limited framework I think is first and foremost an issue for participants and members in this working group from the GNSO side, as, say as the initiating SO, so the ccNSO, does not have any issues with other geographic names and so for that extent, and it's, say, it becomes clear that to move this forward, say, it needs the support of all groups participating but in principle it's, I would say, it's a GNSO issue and not a ccNSO issue. So that's a first observation, comment from a ccNSO staff perspective.

The second one has to do being the staff support of a PDP in the past on the selection of say IDN ccTLDs. Moving forward there might be some overlap between – in future between the subsequent rounds and this existing, say, draft policy.

Because one of the issues which triggered the study group, which triggered the creation of the study group, and which has driven part of the work of this working group is the overlap in definitions between what is in the PDP or in the overall selection or in the overall policy for the selection of IDN ccTLDs, effectively meaningful representation of the name of a country and territory, which is either two, three or for a short name of a country, and the way it's been described under the new – say the first round of new gTLDs.

So in future, just assuming that it may be resolved just under the GNSO subsequent procedures, is probably, I want to warn against it because you've got – do not have just RFC 1591 as an established policy, but also the IDN ccTLD which is the cause of some of the issues causing the overlap between say interpretations.

So these were just two observations from my end. Thank you, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Bart, that's very helpful. Annebeth, to your question I think let's say maybe I'll – I'll speak some comments to agree with your question and then try and figure out how we resolve them.

I think one of the difficulties, and of course we've noted this in this CWG, one of the difficulties is the pace at which the GNSO moves. And I think that that's something that puts other communities into feeling like they're on foreign territory. This goes some way towards Cheryl's comment about energy and motivation, the PDPs meet weekly. And, frankly, need to. There were already complaints at the end of the 2012 new gTLD policy development process that that was overly lengthy in its duration.

And to the extent that we moved anything other than weekly in that process I think we'd still be there trying to develop policy for the first round of new gTLDs. So I suppose we're hamstrung on that. There's a fair bit of work to be done. And someone has to do it. And it takes time to do. So I think that is an obstacle. I see the big green tick from Cheryl there.

That's an obstacle and it's one that, to the extent, you know, that it stops participation, I'm not sure how we as a community tackle that because, you know, again, the work has to be done and we're under this pressure from the Board and from ourselves to do it in a fairly timely way.

I think one thing that we could try and do, Annebeth, that we've done rather well within the GNSO for our own newcomers within the GNSO is we run monthly webinars on exactly the topic which you raised, Annebeth, which is participating in the GNSO; how to participate effectively in GNSO working groups and PDP working groups.

These sessions are fantastically facilitated by our – by our GNSO support staff. They're set up by Nathalie Peregrine and her team. And there are a number of us within the GNSO community that have been asked to headline the thing from a community perspective, let's say, to explain the PDP, explain the policy development processes, probably best not to use the acronym at this point, explain the process, explain this concept of the picket fence, explain how you can participate effectively and this sort of thing.

What I could do, if you think back to – I don't know that we've done those at the start of either subsequent procedures or the RPM PDP, both of which have a very – well first of all very high numbers of participants, and secondly, very high component within those participants of folks from outside the GNSO, we could certainly think about opening up one of those sessions for the broader community to inform participation in those PDPs, as I say, I've been asked to lead a few of those newcomer sessions and I've found them pretty helpful. It's the case, I guess, anyone who's in a teaching position

realizes that they learn more about things when they have to tell others about it.

So that's one possible solution, Annebeth. I don't think, you know, we can't solve the fact that there's a lot of work to be done and these groups meet quite frequently and that is, I understand, a barrier to some people's, you know, constant participation. That said, I live in a very, very (unintelligible), if you like, and so I'm not able to attend every meeting and I still find that, you know, if I attend fairly regular and catch up on the meetings I miss on the recordings that that works rather well.

So, Annebeth, I'll turn to you and then afterwards to Bart.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you very much, Heather. That was quite useful. But I think that one of the problems as well. Well, when I worked with the GAC earlier on for seven years, eight years ago and now the ccNSO, what I see is that those groups are interested in a few of the total aspect of what the GNSO is interested in.

So it's too overwhelming for many of them to follow at all. And they don't know where the things come that they are interested in, there – are going to discuss and have interest in and want to have some discussions about. So I think that's a point as well, it's – as you say, it's in the GNSO it's a lot of work. You have a lot of things, because you have so many different kind of constituencies in GNSO.

It's not, as somebody thinks, that is only the Commercial thing, it's a lot of different interests in the GNSO. But I don't know how we best can find a way to play in the few things that needs to be heard from some of the stakeholders that have smaller or narrower interests than the GNSO without exhausting their interests and working ability, if you see what I mean. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Annebeth, thank you very much. And I wonder if the answer isn't – and this I guess is what we were trying to figure out with speaking to Jeff Neuman in Helsinki, Number 1, I think the subsequent procedures PDP has a benefit over us in that their charter is much broader than ours. They do have the possibility of – or their charter, let's say, covers issues related to geographic names more broadly. This arises out of the work that was done back in 2007 and earlier on the – on the reserve names working group.

So it's clear to us that they have the ability to deal with things in a more substantive way than we do with our limited remit on country and territory names. As I typed into the chat, there are subsequent works, or excuse me, separate work streams within the PDP working group and one of those is, and I've – it's not work stream, I think it's work team, anyway Number 2, I know my number, Work Stream Number 2 is dealing with this issue or this issue falls within the mandate of Work Stream 2 or Work Team 2.

And I think it would be possible if we went back – well at least it's possible to ask. We could go back to the leadership of the work stream and go back to the leadership of the PDP working group and ask could we consolidate this into a sub stream of that work stream, or team, and that might save the problem, Annebeth, of everyone having to attend all of that Work Stream 2, which of course the scope of which is very, very large.

We could potentially carve this out to save the problem that you identify. And I see you've got a comment there in the chat that that sounds like a decent idea. Cheryl, I'll turn to you and then to Bart.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, thank you. I didn't mean to jump the queue, Bart, I apologize. But I'll jump it anyway. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Yes, I think that's a good idea as well, Heather. I put my hand up to say I think what we should be appealing to to have happen is a definite and proactive approach to ensure that just as you do in some forms of advertising and just as you do in some

forms of inclusive design, that we look for opportunities to have specified outreach and engagement with the wider selection of interest groups.

They recognize, we know, you know, the other parts of the ALAC, there's the GAC and there's of course the ccTLD communities as well as the significant interested parties in the various of the ccTLD operational zones. So we're not – it's not a bad design, it just kind of is what it is. But I think we need to look for opportunities to make sure that we're as inclusive as possible and that that happens in a timely manner, not just as she is writ in the rulebook.

I think Annebeth was making really important points and I certainly heard it in the GNSO over the years where that's what, you know, look, we did this for five years and you've all come in late. Let's make sure that isn't the comment that can be made by making sure we interact opportunistically and effectively in small bite size pieces, quite probably in face to face meetings whether or not they're the (unintelligible) meetings or some sort of regional gatherings, but let's do some smart thinking and a little bit of proactive work on this.

Not going to solve it today however, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Cheryl, that would be great, if we could (unintelligible) gold star. Bart please.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Heather. So I sound a little bit like a broken record in the sense of, say, what I see is it doesn't – say, using the PDP on subsequent procedures, and I think in principle it's a good idea, doesn't resolve that in some areas, especially if you start talking about full names of countries, etcetera, there will be an overlap with the policy remit of another SO. And in this case the ccNSO clearly because you only have three.

And I don't know at this stage how to resolve this because, say, if something comes out and affects the ccNSO policy there needs to be a way to deal with this conflict of rules. And that was the fundamental or that was the thinking

behind trying to come up with a harmonized framework on country and territory names in the first place.

But then say then you've got the geographic names as well. It's more – was more a method of trying to resolve potential overlap in policy remits. So the output of this working group could feed into both PDPs. But, yes, it seems that a harmonized framework is not feasible so, yes, I just wanted to raise it, say, as a future concern.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Bart. I think that raises a very interesting question. I'd be very surprised that – if we went back to the Applicant Guidebook we didn't find other areas of overlap. So I'm fairly confident not that I have – not that I sleep with the Applicant Guidebook and spend all day with it, not anymore anyway, but I'd be very confident we're not the only issue, let's say, for which that would be possible that being some sort of overlap with other SO mandates.

I think what that would, let's say, necessitate is anywhere – surely subsequent procedures then would have to tackle this issue in other contexts. And with that in mind, to the extent that they identify some sort of overlap I think they'd have to engage very specifically the SO involved. And that would – that would be a good model, let's say, we could be a good model for how we go and do that.

I'd say I'm not – I'm going to borrow Cheryl's line and say I'm not up with the answer of that problem here on the call. But I do think that that's something that we take back to subsequent procedures and let's say identify to them. I suppose that…

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Heather, sorry, may I jump in for a moment? I just wanted to raise this because, say, this goes back to the fundamental reason for creating this working group in the first place at the time. And I think maybe just say the

answer is unclear, it's – it will come up in other areas in future as well is my guess.

Just raise it and document it and that people take this into consideration when moving forward and be very considerate about it. Naming the problem is already probably half of the solution that people just do things knowingly and being aware of there might be an issue. Maybe I'm a bit too optimistic.

Heather Forrest: Bart, this is Heather. No, I think you're exactly right. I think you've made – I think you made very valid points. And I think where I see that we're going now is perhaps even – I've taken some notes on the side, putting together a list of things that we might like to take questions, comments such as the one Bart's just raised, take back to the subsequent procedures cochairs and say, you know, here are our thoughts.

What I suggest that we do, we have now 14 minutes left on our call. We've had a pretty solid engagement on the conclusions and recommendations of this paper. What I propose still needs to be done is indeed to finalize this progress report. In my view it would be most helpful to take this progress report out to the community and use that as the vehicle for raising these issues and questions and so on with the folks from subsequent procedures rather than randomly sending these things to the folks from subsequent procedures.

But I – and Cheryl has a tick there. Thank you, Cheryl. What I suggest that we do perhaps is take a little more time, if anyone has comments or questions that have not made it into this draft so to the extent that you have comments or questions that's fine. That's very welcome indeed. But in order to be effective we need to try and type things into the draft.

There are a few questions that Annebeth has asked in relation to my proposed amendments to the document, which I will try and address and circulate. Anyone else who has comments that they would like to let's say

impact on the draft, let's do that and perhaps take a week or two, get perhaps to the sensible, to enable more time for folks to do that if they return to work if they've been on summer holidays and what not.

I'd like to bear in mind, though, in terms of the timeline, and this brings us back to our agenda, we are barreling rather rapidly down on our next face to face meeting, which is in Hyderabad. The cochairs have discussed not so much the substance in depth in terms of the substance we're really just members of the CWG, but in terms of the process we have discussed and agreed upon a desire, and I'll ask Annebeth to back me up here, on a desire to have some sort of conclusion on where we are with this by – or excuse me – before Hyderabad that we don't show up to Hyderabad and we're still floundering.

So with the timing in mind, and I see Annebeth's comment in the chat that she agrees on that. And we'll need Carlos and Paul to correct us on the list if we're wrong. But I'm fairly confident that there's agreement there from the two of them.

Our chief concern at this stage is in getting to Hyderabad with some result, whatever that result is. So let's take the time to do our work properly but not be slow about it I suppose is what I'm saying. Perhaps we take two weeks on the list to review the comments that have been made, if your comments aren't into the document or in my case need to be tinkered with in response to questions, then let's do that.

In our next call we'll discuss the next version of the draft if you like and try and bring ourselves to some conclusions at that point will be mid-September, and I think that would be in line with our projected deadline of having this sewn up before we're all on planes for Hyderabad. And that would then put us towards a view of getting together with the folks from subsequent procedures and indeed others in the community as we think about what meetings we would like to have in Hyderabad.

Nigel, I see your hand. Please.

Nigel Cassimire: Yes, thank you, Heather. Can you hear me?

Heather Forrest: Yes, we can, Nigel. Thank you.

Nigel Cassimire: Okay well (unintelligible) is kind of challenged to follow everything. And also pretty much agree with what you propose. Just to say one thing about the progress report, it would be good if we could at least try to put in this something that we agreed on. I mean, it not be a final set of recommendation or specific issue but maybe we might have agreed on (unintelligible) to carry forward or something.

We're still trying to figure out how (unintelligible) the best way to basically (unintelligible) rest of the other communities. But somehow the discussions over time have we found any common ground on any particular issue that we would want to put into the mainstream?

And I think that I'd like to see something on that in the paper as well (unintelligible) earlier versions or earlier documents (unintelligible) to see if there was anything that I could identify. But I'm just throwing that out there and maybe we should try to put in there some – we should try to find some points or principles that we agree on could be (unintelligible). Thank you. Yes, I recognize (unintelligible).

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Nigel, very much for your thoughtful remarks. I think perhaps that that – what that suggests to me is that we could do a little bit more work to clarify in this document the work on to date. You'll see that that – where that fits in our progress report at this point is starting at the bottom of Page 1 under the heading of Groups and Discussions to Date. And perhaps we don't just say groups discussions to date but we make some clearer articulation here of preliminary conclusions and this sort of thing.

And we might also think about appending some of our earlier strawman documents on the substance. Nigel, your hand is up. Is that an old hand or a new hand?

Nigel Cassimire: Sorry, it's an old hand. I need to take it down.

Heather Forrest: Fair enough. I think one of the things that we want to avoid in this document is, let's say, making this document too long. And my concern was let's try and send the community to the other documents with which we've worked as opposed to running this one on to 10 or 15 or 20 pages, which I think is very, very possible.

One of the things that we did achieve that I think is very powerful, and I wouldn't like this – to see the community have to reinvent the wheel, is we did have that strawman document that we were working on from the very beginning when we started two-letter codes that talked about the existing policy framework and how we've gotten to where we are.

And I do – indeed I think that information, that background, that context alone would be very, very helpful to the next stewards of this issue, not only save them a great deal of time but it would raise some of the questions that Bart has articulated in terms of overlap of CC policies and where this appears in the Guidebook and historically how we've gotten to that point.

I think that contextual information would be very helpful to have. Now that is all captured in one of the documents that's referenced here in – at the bottom of Page 1 with the footnote, I think it might be helpful if we pad out our footnotes a little bit more with just the – with information other than just the URL. That'll help identify what those documents are.

Bart, yes please, your hand went up.

Bart Boswinkel: May I suggest, as you did say, that first – that we start producing two documents effectively, say, the strawman and where we've got at is up to the three-letter codes. And I think what is important, first of all, is the methodology used to date is very interesting for future, the background material as you said, and the conclusions around the two-letter codes is probably a good one as well as one of the achievements.

And use that, say, as a parallel document that we start filling it in a little bit more and at the same time we start working on the progress report and then present the two documents at the next meeting, again, to this group. So, yes, we got a full packet almost, a package, for the community. It's – I think the strawman is in reasonable shape in the sense it needs to be – yes, polished, etcetera, but it's got a lot of material in there already, which is almost ready to publish.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Bart. I think that's a good suggestion. And I'm going to take from that, let's say, you've volunteered yourself, Bart. Could you…

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: I know I did. I know I did. Effectively I volunteered Joke and Emily. But I know what I've done. But it's – say, if we go down the path of, say, using this as a progress report and effectively informing the councils after a public comment period, let's say, the work of this working group is on the brink of closure, then we need to come up with some substantive work as well, say, what has been achieved because people will frown a little bit if we end up with just a two-pager.

Heather Forrest: No, quite right. Quite right, Bart. And it's for that reason you can blame me, let's say, for bumping out the footnotes in this document. I added quite a few references to existing documents because I think it's important that the community realize that, and I said this in the – on the list that we haven't come this far with nothing.

So let's – with three minutes left let's sum up where we are and what needs to happen. So Bart, I'd be grateful if you'd work with Emily on having a look at that the earlier document, our – I forget what we had called it – it was – there was a strawman and a straw woman. In any event, that original document that's sitting on our wiki page, if we can get the substantive document not to say that, Bart, it doesn't – the onus doesn't fall on you to make let's say substantive amendments, that's not – we're not putting that on our support staff. But if you can identify any gaps, things where we need some input that would be very helpful.

And then a parallel track would be this document that you see in front of you, which is the progress report post-Helsinki, that's for the broader membership to have a look at. I will undertake to follow up on Annebeth's comments in relation to my proposed amendments. To the extent that anyone has any proposed amendments to the document, please make them within the document and not as a general comment on the list because it's very hard to keep track of lengthy discussions on the list and actually manifest them into the document.

So at this stage let's turn our attention to the document and tinkering with the language in this document. So if we can do that in the next two weeks turnaround in relation to our next call and discuss those I think that would be an admirable way forward and would do something towards our plan of getting this in a better state by the time we're all on planes for Hyderabad.

Any concerns about that as a way forward? Cheryl, was that a yes for concerns or yes you agree for that as a way forward? Okay, big green tick. That's wonderful. That's wonderful. My fault for articulating the way that I did. Never invite the poison arrow.

So there we are, folks. Annebeth, as the other cochair on the call, any concerns from you? Are you happy with this as a way forward? Perfect, well done. I don't know about you – you're much too kind, I think, is how it goes.

Look, folks, apologies, I've been in the noisy place for the call today so apologies if you've had any trouble hearing me along the way, hopefully not. Thank you very much for your participation in today's call. Much appreciated, I hope you've all had a very, very restful summer. And here in the Southern Hemisphere we're looking forward to summer beginning. Woke up this morning and it was zero degrees. So there we are. All the very best to everyone and we'll look forward to speaking to you on the next call. Thanks very much. Bye now.

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Thanks. Bye, Heather.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you. Again, the meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop the recordings and disconnect all remaining lines. Everyone, enjoy the rest of your day.

END