

ICANN Transcription
Cross-Community WG on Use of Country/Territory Names as TLDs
Monday, 19 September 2016 at 21:00 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 call on the Monday, 19 September 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 is available at:

<https://community.icann.org/x/Ux2sAw>

The audio is available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-cwg-ctn-19sep16-en.mp3>

Coordinator: The recordings have started. You may now proceed.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thanks (Kristine). Appreciate it. All right. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the CWG UCTN call on the 19th of September at 2100 UTC.

On the call today we do have Heather Forrest, Griffin Barnett, Milagros Castanon Seoane, Carlos Raul Gutierrez, Maxim Alzoba, Rosalia Morales, Timo Vohmar, Annebeth Lange, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Sebastien Pensis, Laura Watkins, Al Schubert, Griffin Barnett, Jaap Akkerhuis. We also have Mirjana Tasic.

We do have apologies from Sanna Sahlman and Susan Payne. And from staff we have Joke Braeken, Steve Chan, Emily Barabas, Bart Boswinkel and myself Michelle DeSmyter.

As a reminder, please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you. And I'll turn the call back over to Carlos Gutierrez.

Carlos Gutierrez: Thank you very much. And hello everybody. Good morning, good evening wherever you are. Thank you very much for joining this call. In terms of the roll call, I just want to ask if there is anybody on the phone line who is not on the Adobe room. Please stand your name. So it seems we have everybody on the Adobe room.

Thank you again. As you know, we are here in the County and Territory Names discussion. We are in the evaluation round of the comments that we got from all of you on the three letter codes.

And over the last few weeks we prepared - staff prepared an excellent paper on where we are in terms of two letter codes and three letter codes. And we had a discussion between the chairs last week on that document. It was a little bit late on the week. We're sorry.

We think it's an excellent paper and without a long notice we asked staff to distribute this document. So we think it's a great status report. It is a great document on two letter codes and three letter codes.

As you know, we never got into the third chapter of the full names. And without further ado, I would ask staff to walk us through the document for a moment and then we go back to our discussion, how long do you think you want to comment on this document and what the next steps should be. So if there are no other questions to the agenda, Bart, the floor is yours.

Bart Boswinkel: So it's - let's go through the progress report first Carlos because that was shared with the group a week ago. And that's up in the room unless you really want to discuss the interim report first.

Carlos Gutierrez: I'm sorry Bart. I was so into the interim report. Let's talk about the progress report first.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. So Joke, explain what happened and then we go into the next steps.

Joke Braeken: Absolutely. I won't too much of your time. But I just quickly want to go through the progress report, which was fairly non-contentious at least the party of the progress report was - there were no strong disagreements there.

This report was prepared by staff and provides upon the request of the co-Chairs and provides actually an overview of the discussion to date and the conclusions and recommendations that this working group formulates.

First of all, we described the objective and the scope of the working group and used the language of the charter of the working group. There were a few paragraphs that have been adjusted based on the comments and the inputs received.

And secondly, the group discussions to date were outlined. We started first with the two letter representations of country and territory names, moved over to the three letter representations. There are a few small comments that are still pending.

One of them is the one regarding one of the examples of the outcome of the inconsistencies and the framework of how three letter representations were being dealt with.

And then this chapter is a little bit longer. It also talks about the way input was collected from the other groups within the ICANN environment. So there was a survey that was being distributed with the supporting organizations and the various communities. And this let them into the cross community session in Helsinki.

The report was prepared as a follow up of this cross community session in Helsinki. There's a few comments and observations that are being detailed in this document.

Before we move onto the recommendations, which are actually the more contentious part of this document, may I ask Michelle perhaps to - in the Adobe room to pull up the next slide unless of course there are any comments or questions regarding the body of the document of the progress report from the working group members or co-Chairs.

Carlos Gutierrez: I see no hands in the room Joke. Who is going to go through the recommendations?

Joke Braeken: As you prefer Carlos, I can do that if you want. If you would prefer to go through them yourself, that's absolutely fine as well.

Carlos Gutierrez: No. I suggest you go one by one and we would let anybody raise their hand if they want to comment individually and then we go for a full discussion. You go ahead.

Joke Braeken: Thank you. Absolutely agreed. So this is Joke again speaking for the record. In this slide that you see currently displayed in the Adobe Connect room there are the - on top of the page the recommendations as they are included into the progress report with - and the sidebar the comments that have been received.

There was one lengthy comment that we received on the mailing list by Alexander Schubert. And I tried to summarize it at the bottom of this page so that we have a complete overview of all the comments that have been received regarding the recommendations.

So I will try to make it a little bit bigger so that's easier to read. So the first recommendation is - outlines the fact that the ICANN community consolidates

all policy efforts relating to geographic names. And that is the only way in which this working group determines whether a harmonized framework is truly achievable.

Having no comments regarding this first recommendation, however there have been a few comments regarding the second recommendation where it says that future work should take place within the authority of a policy development process on the ICANN bylaws.

There are quite a few comments that have been received regarding this second recommendation. I'm not sure if any of the people that commented on this would like to raise their hands and discuss this. I see that Annebeth raised her hand.

Carlos Gutierrez: Yes. Annebeth. Yes.

Annebeth Lange: Yes.

Carlos Gutierrez: Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Yes.

Carlos Gutierrez: Please go ahead.

Annebeth Lange: Annebeth Lange here for the record. I actually commented on this after having seen Timo's suggestion. Because I think that it is - since this is a working group with different members from the different communities, it should be at least commented on. And why? Because (listen to) Timo's suggestion.

I don't know if he's here. It seems like if he is - Timo is on the list. But if he would like to comment on his suggestion, I think that would be a good idea.

One thing that is a problem here is that it is - when we are suggesting to moving everything to the GNSO PDP, that's what the result of this is.

And then it is a problem because the GNSO PDP cannot resolve the fundamental issue that the ccNSO when the GNSO used different descriptions and definitions around country and territory names in use.

So the difference - the definition today what is in the (ATB) and Fast Track and overall IDN ccTLD policy process and the overlaps. This is illustrated in the evolution of the (ATB) version that has been described in the next - in the Annex B that we're going to discuss.

But there is some problems here by moving everything that has to do with country and territory names into the GNSO PDP. So I would like to hear other comments on this from other members. Thank you.

Carlos Gutierrez: Thank you. Thank you Annebeth. And we have to remind ourselves the difference between the substantive part and the process. I mean in the previous round the country and territory names were reserved.

And what we are dealing here is the question if we leave it here or not or who would have to deal with that. But before we jump into these troubled waters, let me ask Rosalia to give her comments hoping that we can keep both issues separate. One is the process and one is the substantive part and we have focused so far - go ahead Rosalia.

Rosalia Morales: Hello. Can you hear me okay? Because I just changed my volume preferences.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes Rosalia. We can hear you.

Carlos Gutierrez: You sound very well and very...

Rosalia Morales: Okay. Wonderful. So I just wanted to follow up with Annebeth's comments and Timo's comments I hope he can comment on. As I mentioned, the comments I think it is definitely important to add another process to not only include the GSNO PDP process.

I do not think the ccTLD community feels represented through this process. And I know I have expressed this opinion and have received comments regarding this opinion. But I still feel that a multi-stakeholder multi-community PDP process would definitely be a better option where all these different opinions can be included.

And that goes for Recommendation Number 2, which has been clearly going towards recommending only the GNSO PDP process. And I open this to discussion. And I would actually really appreciate if Carlos you would comment.

You just mentioned the - in the chat something related to this discussion would only lead to discussions within the gTLDs. And I have to say that I strongly agree with him. I think this discussion is - goes way beyond gTLDs. It includes many other topics that need to be discussed in an open community environment.

Carlos Gutierrez: I'm sorry. Thank you very much Rosalia. I put myself in the line. And I want to make something clear. That I don't want to start the discussion here about the - which - who is in charge of - I mean we have a clear development to (evaluate) their expansion of the DNS.

This has been assigned to a PDP on subsequent rounds. It has been divided in four work tracks. There is a work track that is specifically looking at the application process and the initial process and all legal issues and so on.

And we are not trying to push anything there. Neither has the PDP their aspiration to do it. We have a placeholder for all reserved names of the previous rounds and that's it. Okay.

So I will ask people to keep this separate and ready to discuss whatever you want. But (unintelligible) through the subsequent rounds and I think we have other ones here and let's not these things before we get to the other side of the river.

So please, if Alexander wants to comment, I think he's next. And I will ask Annebeth and Rosalia if those are old hands, please put them down. Thank you very much. Alexander, go ahead.

Alexander Schubert: Yes. Hello. This is Alexander. Can you hear me?

Carlos Gutierrez: Yes we can hear you.

Alexander Schubert: Okay. That's great.

((Crosstalk))

Carlos Gutierrez: So there is - Alexander, please. There is an echo. So if you lower the volume it might help because there is some echo from your side I'm afraid.

Alexander Schubert: There is some what?

Carlos Gutierrez: We have some echo.

Alexander Schubert: Okay. Well it seems you can hear me. The - Rosalia said it quite well. I mean it's the PDP regarding the territory names in the next round and the scope of our working group seems to be completely independent.

I see a very, very (loose) overlap but if anything an overlap. So what this working group is trying to (attend) it's important and it should be done. But it has close (too many) to do the PDP for the next round.

The problem is that the people who are conducting the PDP for the next round have been told wait and - wait. Don't talk about (confident) and ISO 3166.

Carlos Gutierrez: I didn't do it. I didn't cut Alexander.

Woman: He disappeared.

Carlos Gutierrez: But I lost (it). Can staff please check what happened with Alexander's connection?

Alexander Schubert: So and can you hear me now?

Carlos Gutierrez: Yes. You are back Alexander. Please go ahead.

Alexander Schubert: Yes. Sorry. So something happened with the Adobe Connect here. It kind of deactivated my microphone. How much had you heard of what I said?

Carlos Gutierrez: Yes Alexander. You started explaining your views about something we are not talking about here. You started explaining you views about the PDP. But we (are here) in the PDP. We are here in the ccNSO GNSO Working Group on the use of country and territory names. So please go ahead.

Alexander Schubert: And exactly. And that's the problem. And the (unintelligible) PDP has been told to not talk about country and territory names and ISO 3166 code because there would be some working group, which is us, that would (unintelligible).

So I would say we go to the people who do conduct the next gTLD PDP and tell them please don't wait for us because we will have another solution for you. The - and (we already) agree what you are looking for. (It's really) something completely different, which might have provided an input for you guys.

But don't wait for it because we don't have anything ready and go and create your own solution for the next PDP. That's all I'm saying. Otherwise we are on track and we can discuss this matter forever and find one size fits all solutions for the second and the third and whatever level. And but I don't think that it will provide any input for the next round PDP in the GNSO.

Carlos Gutierrez: Okay. Thank you very much Alexander. The point is well taken. I don't think they are waiting as far as I recall from the meetings. But we will have four hours of subsequent rounds in Hyderabad and I'm participating in (their cause) as well. So the point is well taken. Next we have Timo. Please go ahead.

Timo, do you want to talk or do you want (start) typing? Somebody's typing. Would you (please stop)? Would you please stop typing unless you are on mute please? Thank you. Timo, do you want to - Timo, you seem to be muted. Can you check your mic?

Well let's give Timo and second to fix his audio. I hate to do that. We don't want this morning to be discussion about not letting people speak. I don't want to go into that one again. But in the meantime I will ask Heather to use the (unintelligible). Then we will go back to Timo.

Heather Forrest: Thank you Carlos. This is Heather Forrest. And I see Timo's comment in the chat but he's not quite sure what's wrong from his end. It might be that we need to dial to Timo. So Timo, if you want to have a separate comment to staff, they might be able to help you out.

So a few points raised. I think Carlos has made a very valid point here that we're probably blending several issues together in the comments that have been raised so far.

And my concern with and indeed support for Recommendation 2 is that I think one of the key failings of our group is that it's really not clear what the status of our output is let's say if our output or how our output can be used, that's not clear from a bylaws point of view. Even under the amended bylaws it's not clear what a cross community working group can do in terms of developing policy.

Perhaps that's - some see that as a minor issue but it's something that I'm generally quite concerned about in work on the GNSO Council last year and other cross community working groups.

In terms of our mandate - in terms of our ability to carry out what it is that we have been chartered to do, I don't think that we're able to do that. And I think that became very clear to me in the session that we had in Helsinki - the cross community session on geographic names.

Our mandate is to determine whether or not it's feasible to develop a harmonized framework. And to the extent that we can continue in our work here, my answer to that will be no. I don't believe based on the information that we have now that it's possible to develop a harmonized framework.

Now that's the end of our mandate. That's all we have to do here. We have two questions to answer. One is it feasible to develop a harmonized framework; two, if it is feasible, what would that framework look like? And I think the co-Chairs walked away from that from both sides of the fence.

And Annebeth will correct me if I'm wrong. But I think we walked away from that public session in Helsinki and said based on what we've seen in the

room, the comments that were made, the very helpful sort of comment capture room survey thing that ran in the background in that session.

And based on the comments that were raised and concerns that were raised, we didn't see that it was possible that we could really continue in our mandate. So with that in mind, that's what's motivated the drafting of the recommendations here.

This isn't some, you know, a whatever (theme) that's on the co-Chairs or staff's part to try and get rid of this Cross Community Working Group. It's a concern that at least as our mandate is drafted this is not looking like we're in a position either to achieve the result that perhaps we hope to or which is to say something substantive rather than a yes/no answer.

Or - and/or it's not clear that, you know, what we can (achieve) let's say how that fits into the broader process. Now that's the one issue in terms of the recommendation. And that's I think maybe what Carlos is trying to say in the comments here. I'll say something very briefly just to correct some earlier comments about the GNSO PDP. They are in being holding off on discussing geographic names.

At the last meeting of the work stream that's involved with the issue of reserved names and you'll see from the earlier, the 2007 and 2008 work of the Reserved Names Working Group, which was a GNSO PDP Working Group that predated the production of the applicant guidebook that all of the discussions that we've been having now about two letter codes and three letter codes and geographic names were also had in that working group of 2007 and 2008.

So it was a very natural discussion then. The GNSO doesn't see what has changed since. So they intend to have those discussions again. Now that said, I did ask that the group - and Cheryl was on the call. I did - and I see Cheryl's comment in the chat.

I did ask that the group might consider waiting on the issue until this group had had a chance to prepare the substantive report that will come next. This document in front of us is, if you like, an executive summary or just an update to the community on where we are.

I assume it would get published before the substantive report that we're about to discuss next, which is, if you like, our interim or what would be a final report from this group. This is a document that we've been working on plugging information into throughout the time of the CWG existence.

And I said, you know, to the extent it looks like this CWG is going to wind up its work and summarize the failings in its own charter and summarize why it wasn't able to proceed any further, let's hold off as subsequent procedures PDP until we have that valuable work. And let's not reinvent the wheel and let's not have these discussions again simply going forward without the benefit of 2-1/2 years' worth of excellent work from this CWG.

So in terms of the timing, I wanted to make that correction. And I appreciate the comments that were there in the chat from Cheryl in relation to that discussion. So that's the understanding. That's the logic behind why subsequent procedures has delayed, if you like, it's work with - you know, I think that it's sensible that it do so in the context of this group's report. So thank you very much.

Carlos Gutierrez: Thank you very much Annebeth. Sorry for saying that we had only a placeholder. That's the way non-lawyers start. But you explain it in a very, very nice manner. And we'll take note and try to keep it in my head like that.

Now I have a problem with the line and I feel that Alexander is an old hand and that Timo dropped from the call or is Timo still in the call and he wants to bring his comments before Annebeth please. Timo. Timo, can you hear us?

Bart Boswinkel: He's speaking but we can't hear you Timo. Timo, if you put your comments - this is Bart. If you put your comments in the chat, just type them in, I'll put them in the notes for the record as well. So we have them in separate places.

Carlos Gutierrez: Okay. Thank you very much Bart. Okay. Thank you very much Bart. So (unintelligible) very much. Alexander, I hope we have cleared the question of the relationship between this working group and the official PDP, which are basically differing. Annebeth, you're next.

Annebeth Lange: Annebeth Lange here. And I agree with Heather that during - we have done everything we possibly could do to try to find a common framework. And that was what our mandate was.

But that doesn't solve the question that if we now put everything into the hands of the GNSO PDP, we still have the problem with the different definitions that are mentioned. So it couldn't be - it couldn't solve everything about the country and territory names. So we have to find a solution to that as well.

Carlos Gutierrez: Thank you very much Annebeth. And I think we have some ideas still to discuss here. We were on Number 2 and we tried to bring the comments of Alexander in. Timo as well but Timo couldn't fix his. So I want to go back to Joke and to Recommendation Number 2 and see they're on track of what the recommendation said and we have solved all the worries that we have heard. Joke, please.

Joke Braeken: I think that everybody - this is Joke speaking. And I think that everybody that raised concerns had an opportunity to speak up during this call regarding the concerns.

In terms of how Recommendation Number 2 should be formulated, Bart, maybe your advice could be helpful in this.

Bart Boswinkel: Sorry. I've been taking notes. Let's see and - let's - my suggestion is based on this one that we send out an update of the progress report early next week for a second and final reading.

I'd say - I've gotten - we've gotten the notes and we need to consult with the co-Chairs and then send out a final - not a final but a suggested language.

And maybe it's just let's say that let's say that moving forward with the - is recommended and then identifying some issues, particularly the one that's been raised by (Rosalia) and others, is - there will be a point in time where you will see that it's not just the GNSO policy that may be affected and will need to change but also other policies, in particular from the ccNSO, the ones around the IDN ccTLDs that caused the whole issue around meaningful representation. So maybe that's the way forward, I don't know.

Carlos Gutierrez: Well thank you very much, Bart, for saying the magic words. I will just recommend not to become to apologetic or looking who is at fault or if it fails or not. I think the definition of the charter was very broad and the answer is no general framework, not for (unintelligible), not for names, period, and then open up the discussion where it should go back. And that should be enough for redrafting recommendation two, right? I don't know if you want to comment on that, Annabeth, please.

Annabeth Lange: I have a little problem with hearing you now. Could you repeat, Carlos? Do you hear me?

Carlos Gutierrez: Yes. Yes, Annabeth. We are discussing - yes we are discussing recommendation two, and Bart just said that he's going to think if he has some specific wording about sending it back somewhere else, I don't want to say where. And my suggestion was to keep the recommendation as general as possible and not to sound apologetic. The just answer is no, we have no general framework, period. And Heather says here in the chat that she has a suggestion. So, Heather, would you please?

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Carlos. I just want to make sure Annabeth put her hand down, make sure I wasn't jumping the queue. I think it would be helpful if we focused on recommendations one and three. Can we focus our attention here very briefly? Is there any disagreement with recommendations one or three? Anyone put their hand up? Anyone green on their tick? I don't see...

Carlos Gutierrez: Can we enlarge recommendation number three and ask (unintelligible) to go through it please? Won't we need with number two as well?

Heather Forrest: Sure, we can do that. My suggestion would be this: if one and three are uncontroversial, then what I suggest that we do is we agree now. I mean I think Bart has an appropriate idea, which is that we recirculate this document. But to the extent that we can agree now on one and three, we keep them in the document in the form that they're in or tinker with them here, depending on what we decide to do with the precise wording. And then we park number two, let's say. I would put number two below the line.

I don't think it's appropriate that we have the comments of, you know, just one person here now that we've had a fuller discussion. So we have (Alexander)'s summarized comments here. What I think would be helpful is that we pull number two below the line and we summarize some of the discussions that we had in relation to number two. We try and capture them in this document and say, "The group has agreed on number one and number three." And of course we circulate that for more comments.

Number two the following concerns were raised, and we try and summarize those here. That could be included in the next draft. This is a pretty common procedure when reports of this type go out that, you know, if there's not agreement then we try and summarize why there wasn't agreement on a particular point. To the extent that any individual would like to submit their own version of comments, if you like, a minority statement or something like

this, or a particular statement on any of these recommendations, then it's open to them to do so.

But I think if we're able as a group in a call today, it would be a pretty solid achievement if we can agree on one and three, and in principle on the rest of the report, the substantive part that sits before these recommendations. Then from a process point of view, this goes out for another round of comments after staff have had a chance, if I can impose on staff, or we can do it as co-chairs, to bring two down, summarize the comments that are made two and go forward from there. And there will at least allow us to progress on this document. Thank you.

Carlos Gutierrez: Thank you. Thank you very much, Heather. And I see that quite a few people have agreed that this is a good idea, one and three. And based on the suggestion of the next round of reading that Bart made before, I just want to ask staff if we can wrap up this part of the discussion and then move to the other document if they're happy or if they have more questions, please. You okay with that, Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Oh for me it's clear. Joke, you have any questions, or Emily?

Joke Braeken: No further questions, thank you. This was Joke speaking.

Bart Boswinkel: Emily, (Steve)?

Emily Barabas: No further questions. This is Emily. Thanks.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

Carlos Gutierrez: Okay, thank you very much. This is kind of (unintelligible) generalist type of document and please take the time to go through the second reading. As I said, my personal view is no need to sound apologetic. And now to the point I've been waiting all along, can we go then to the next point in the agenda,

Bart? We were a little bit slow in the beginning in the month of August, but over the next - over the last few weeks, we have taken quite some time to work on compiling the second chapter of our paper.

You remember a few months ago we had a strawman on three letter codes. Then over the summer we decided to go to a straw-woman on three letter codes. We had great participation, very active participation. And as Heather said before, as we walked out of the community discussion in Helsinki, we decided to save all aspects of their research, because it took us a long time to get all of the information together. We also wanted to collect all the positions of the survey and the discussions we had in Helsinki, and staff was kind enough to work hard. And I will give Bart the opportunity to walk us through these drafts that he distributed late last week. Please, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Carlos. So I'll run through it very quickly just as - to explain, say, what staff did over the last couple of - effectively since our last call when we started working on this document. So what we've done is we've merged the strawman, some of you may recall, and the straw-woman, so now we have a child, and that's in front of you.

And based on that one is, as you can see from the table of contents, it goes back again to the background of the use of country and territory names in the DNS. Let me go through that chapter because I think that is the most substantive thing we've done until now. One of the things we want to do is the executive summary. As you will see, it includes the recommendations to date on some of them, including the notes. So this will - is just will be updated together with the ones the group agreed on the progress report recommendations.

Also what we've included and we need to find a better term for it, and I think we've already seen some comments with better terminology, but as it is - will be very rich in background material, it is for those who are just interested in the recommendations and probably the rationale between the

recommendations, it is - it's - we need to really have something to assist these people focusing on, say, the material and the report.

If you're more interested in for example the evolution of the DNS and how the ISO3166 relates to it, we need to include it as well. And if you're very interested on the evolution of, say, the definition of country and territory names, again that's another way of looking at it. So that's what we will attempt in this part of the section of the introduction and executive summary.

So what we - and probably most of you will have forgotten what we've already done over the past year, or one and half, two years, it's the background information on the formative years, which is effectively you could almost say it's chapter one. So it's - and this is a little bit expanded now, and ROC5091 of course is included and then as are say the evolution of (unintelligible) ROC5091 is now described as well.

And as some of you will recall, we have this section on the functioning of the maintenance agency because that's probably still very - yes in the miss of times, and people were not very close to ISO3166, still have no real understanding what its role and function is, as well as to - and saying that was produced by (Yap) at some point, as well as a brief description of what is ISO3166 and what is - yes, what is included, so what are we really talking about when we talk about ISO3166?

Because again, there is a lot of myth around ISO3166, the different interpretations and what people refer to. And this is what you could see in a lot of the language in, say, not just in the, say, in the work of the ccNSO and in the work of the GNSO all around country or dealing with the country and territory names, starting with I would say the fast track process, et cetera. There is a lot of education needed in order to really understand what is ISO3166 about.

So that's now included as well. We maybe need to expand. And one of the, again, a little reference to the country and - the use of country and territory names as TLDs in the first and subsequent round of new gTLDs in 2001, 2003, because there was already some reference to why they were excluded at the time. And then moving forward, the - in, say, country and territory names as part of the new gTLD process, and what we've done as staff expanded this one a lot. And as you may recall, there was already an Annex A, which is now Annex B, and I'll scroll to it in a minute, which recorded the work of the Reserved Names Working Group that Heather alluded to.

And so bear with me, I have to scroll down. That's probably the major change that is -- here we go -- Annex A, that's again from the just - so that's from the straw-woman, strawman. But Annex B has been expanded a lot, so the Reserved Names Working Group, that's what Heather alluded to. But what's included now as well in this section is the GAC principle regarding use of country and territory names, because that's from that same time. If you go back, that's from 2007. So that relates to it as well.

And as you can see, as you will see, and this is almost recording the history around it, it's country - the use of country and territory names in the applicant guidebook and how that evolved over time. And that's an interesting one. And this is - and I think that's where Annabeth's comments came from. Say if you look, say, initially, it alluded to meaningful representations of country and territory names, but then it moved into - it's also, say, how based on, say, the comments from the community and the discussions within the ICANN board, the way country and territory names in the applicant guidebook are represented has changed over time, especially since AGB version three, and then it got stable in four.

So that's what we tried to capture here as well. So it's just a recording of history. So this Annex B is all about the history. It's another way of - it's not capturing, say, what the study group did in, say, what policies apply, this is

just capturing the, say, how country and territory names were defined within the, say, the new gTLD rounds, as part of that small section in the overview.

What still needs to - and I'm scrolling back. I think at the time, the working group already agreed, but this is all open for comments of course, because that's done quite some time ago, the background on the study group and then the background on the CCWG. And then moving into the methodology the working group used, and I think this is quite - this is the area where we can capture, say, the surveys that have been sent around, et cetera.

Because I think, say, as we discussed with the co-chairs, it's one of the - probably it's been very informative for the working group itself and it's a nice way of expanding work of a working group, say that a working group goes back to the community, try to get some feedback from the community just to inform the discussions. It's something - it's not as heavy handed as a public comment, et cetera, it's really to seek as much input as possible for a broader and more in depth discussion.

So from that perspective, I think it's what I've said been support for quite a few working groups. It's a nice way of recording and using a tool that is starting to develop and to assist even other working groups. So that's what needs to be captured in the methodology part. And then there is still the area of the discussion and recording what the discussion in - around the three letter codes, and that still needs to be done.

My suggestion is that we as staff try to do that as much as possible and that you as working group members comment on this. Because I think that's the easiest way to make progress. So at the end of the day, look, it's - try to get a interim report out by or just before the Hyderabad meeting. And the reason to call this interim report, let me explain this as well.

If you would look at the charter, this report is intended to seek public comments from the community. As such, and therefore - and if you look at

the charter, that report is called the interim report. As soon as, say, the working group meets to, say, after the public comment, we'll take it into account, where if needed update its report, and that's called the final - draft final report, which will be sent to the chartering organizations, so that's the GNSO, ccNSO, for adoption. Once they've taken a decision, then the final report - or the report is finalized, including the resolutions of the chartering organization.

So if we can do this, say, take a, say finalize this at or just after the Hyderabad meeting, I think we're well underway and this will inform the subsequent round and potentially other efforts as well. So that's the brief overview I had for you.

Carlos Gutierrez: Thank you very much, Bart. And thank you very much for staff for bringing that together, and thank you very much to all of you who have given input into this. Actually this is a personal comment. I'm (unintelligible) that we have to spend a year to collect all of this information in one place, in one paper. I'm really surprised that ICANN that wants to be more open and accessible and wants to bring people faster on board for as volunteers or whatever makes it so difficult to get this information in one place.

And that's the only part I really wonder why does it take that long to reconstruct that, and I really congratulate Bart for this Annex B, which is an excellent reading because it shows where the big efforts are, what did the board do to come out of the problem, what is the GAC's position, and what did this working group do.

So in the end, those are the points of decisions that were made, (Alexander). And we have to look at these points of decision and not worry too much about the PDP. I don't think it changes much if we go to the PDP or if we don't go to the PDP if we don't analyze what happened in the past and reconsider why this information was distributed in so many comments to different documents (unintelligible).

So I think from that point of view we have made great progress, and I really recommend everybody in the group to forget a little bit the process and spend the next two weeks looking at this document, because that's how far we've got and instead of wondering what - who can take advantage or who is at fault, we have to sell this document as good as possible and as loud as possible in Hyderabad so that this makes progress in the future. Heather, please.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Carlos, very much. I thought it would be let's say important to emphasize given your comment that you've just made about the time that it's taken to put this together, I think it's important that we recognize that this information actually it's not new to this group in the sense that this is - it's new combined, not new, but newly combined. The strawman paper that we've had published and put together some time ago now set up the format for this paper, what we thought would be our, you know, ultimately our interim and final report. And then our straw-woman on three letter codes was simply added into this.

So I just don't want anyone to walk away concerned, thinking that, you know, in two weeks this paper has been drafted. Really what has happened is we've taken two existing papers and merged them together. That maybe puts some concerns at ease in terms of them, you know, yes this is not a rush job and it hasn't taken us this amount of time to put this together. In fact it's two and half years of work here. And it's just an ugly job of having to merge two documents and the formatting and the nitpicky stuff and that sort of thing.

So, you know, our sincere thanks to staff for putting up with those formatting errors and to say just, you know, again for transparency, because I think Carlos makes some excellent points, the co-chairs saw this document a few days ago before you did and had a very brief comment just to make sure that the integrity of the two reports were maintained and that in fact the idea we had discussed, whether it was sensible to merge the two, and so we had a

brief chat before this meeting at the end of last week just to make sure that that had in fact work.

So in my view it has, though I'll let Annabeth then and Carlos speak. I think Carlos has spoken quite favorably about this. I think the format has worked and we've achieved merging the two documents. So that just clarifies things a bit. Thank you.

Carlos Gutierrez: Thank you very much, Heather. Do we have - let me see, okay. We have agreement on that. I hope there is no confusion between the progress report and this document, because I was at fault at the beginning. I didn't understand it. I hope it's very clear. And the next steps that we have discussed here is that people take a second reading at the interim report and then take this longer document and put it under the pillow for the next two weeks and every time they wake up they can read something. And I think it's very interesting and they can put their words at rest that most of the issues that we have discussed are already mentioned in this paper, and if they are not, there is still time to do it.

We have only one minute left to strategize about our next face-to-face meeting. Bart, please.

Bart Boswinkel: Just with respect to - two things before we go. If people do have comments already, please send them to the list or to staff directly so we can include it already. So I'll - we'll be working on our update of this one and send it around, say, when we have next call -- and I think we have already scheduled the next call -- that we sent it out well ahead of time so you have more time to read it.

So just where I noted, we sent it out very closely to the meeting but we thought it, especially the co-chairs as Heather said, thought it was valuable to share it will you already at this stage so you can see where we're heading and how the two reports fit together, say, how the progress report is very

clearly setting the direction of (unintelligible) and this will underpin it and report on what the working group really has done.

As to your question do you want to say, I think it would be useful that this working group has first of all before we hit Hyderabad has a one or two other calls to at least the first one to finalize the progress report and then the second one maybe to take a deeper stab at this one, and the second call is to have - the second other call is to have - try to come up with, say, real progress on the interim report.

As to the - your question about face-to-face meeting, given where we are at this stage and given the expectations in the community around the country and territory names, the co-chairs with staff discussed the need and feasibility of a face-to-face meeting of the working group in Hyderabad. And as far as I understand, based on the - and the interim report could be part of that, it depends on where we are, part of that discussion as well.

It's based on say what we've seen, we are now tentatively looking at the Saturday, and I don't know which date it is, Saturday the - I think it's the 5th of November, for a face-to-face meeting late in the afternoon for this working group. So we'll inform you once we, say, we've got this confirmed. But in principle I think it's on Saturday afternoon, and it's the final slot on that Saturday before...

Carlos Gutierrez: Thank you very much, Bart. And thank you everybody for bearing with us. We have a plan, we have two calls before Hyderabad. We have to finish the progress report in the next - over the next two calls, and the paper has a little bit more time, Heather says. Thank you very much everybody and I hope we will meet timely in two weeks' time. Thank you very much.

Woman: Thanks everybody.

Woman: Thanks, Carlos.

Carlos Gutierrez: Bye-bye.

Woman: Bye-bye.

END