

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

TRANSCRIPT

Tuesday 26 August 2014 at 1900 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ccwg-unct-20140826-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

ccNSO

Ron Sherwood, .vi
Mirjana Tasic, .rs
Laura Hutchison, .uk
Daniel Kalchev, .bg
Lise Fuhr, .dk
Mary Uduma, .ng
Young-Eum Lee, .kr

GNSO

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

Jaap Akkerhuis, ISO 3166 expert

At-Large

Cheryl Langdon-Orr

Jordi Iparraguirre

Apologies:

Annebeth Lange, .no

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings

Glen de Saint Gery

Bart Boswinkel

Patrick Jones

Terri Agnew

Man: The conference is now being recorded.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the Cross-Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs on the 26th of August, 2014. On the call today we have Ron Sherwood, Mirjana Tasic, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Lisa Fuhr, Chris Chaplow, Daniel Kalchev, Hector Manoff, Maxim Alzoba, Jordi Iparraguirre, Laura Hutchison, Patrick Jones, Jaap Akkerhuis, Scott Harlan, Mary Uduma, and Heather Forrest with apologies from Annebeth Lange.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Bart Boswinkel, and myself - Terri Agnew. I would also like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thank you Bart. Thank you everyone very much for being on the call. Thank you very sincerely to staff for circulating our agenda for today and keeping us on track and telling us where we need to be.

I am very happy to pick up with our agenda. We have a number of things to do picking up from our meeting in London and primarily discussing the study group final report and in particular the typology that's developed around that. We have a number of let's say key tasks today that go to the purpose of the working group.

The first one is to confirm the description of the policy set out in the study group final report. And the second thing is to discuss the typology. I'm happy to open the floor to anyone who has any questions, any issues, anyone seeking background information in terms of how the study group came about, the description of policies, existing policies in relation to the use of country and territory names.

All right, not hearing any questions, I have a question, which is to say could ccNSO colleagues fill us in on the status of - yes, go ahead. No, I thought I heard someone out there.

Bart Boswinkel: Hi it's unmuted.

Heather Forrest: What's that?

Bart Boswinkel: I unmuted, Heather.

Heather Forrest: You unmuted, I see, I see. Could ccNSO colleagues give us a quick update on - and I'm just flipping through here so I go for the exact procedure. The IDN overall policy, that was in progress when we were working on the study group. And I wonder where we are with that.

Bart Boswinkel: Probably - Heather this is Bart for the transcript purposes. Let me explain where we are and from that perspective because the ccNSO itself has completed its tasks and the policy and the board report has been submitted to the ICANN Board of Directors, including - and this is a typical thing for the overall policy - including a recommendation on the, what is called the second panel for confusing similarity.

What is happening right now is that the second panel has been implemented for experimental reasons in the fast track to see whether the proposed panel would add value in the process. And we are waiting for the outcome of some additional requests. Once they have been -- say these additional requests were say handled by the second panel - have been completed, there's potentially a review of this methodology before the policy itself will be submitted to the board to take a vote.

This is to avoid that the board will take a vote without any knowledge on the potential impact of the second panel on the overall process. So that's where we are.

We have a board - say the board report has been completed and has been submitted to the board. We are waiting - staff is waiting for the outcome of requests under the second panel and potentially will review the process with the community and then it will be with the recommendation submitted to the board. Does that answer your question?

Heather Forrest: This is Heather for the transcript. Thank you Bart very much. Does that align with - in terms of our final report for the study group - does that align with the review that says -- the review whether or not an IDN, a selected IDN ccTLD string is confusing or similar -- similar is a process that they should be conducted externally and independently. Is that that what you're describing?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Heather Forrest: Okay, all right. I'm just making sure, let's say, that one of our primary obligations is I understand it was in the working group and starting off was simply to establish whether this is also current and a baseline. So my questions are driving at are there any changes to what we have within the study group report (unintelligible)...

Bart Boswinkel: No. We...

Heather Forrest: ...you we haven't. We've advanced things further, let's say, but we're still consistent with what was set out in the study group report. Is that a correct assessment?

Bart Boswinkel: That is correct.

Heather Forrest: Excellent.

Bart Boswinkel: So put it this way. The reflection in the study report, all the recommendations of the recommended policy is still the status. Nothing has changed. The status of the report itself has changed. It is now a board report so the submission of the ccNSO to the ICANN Board of Directors.

Heather Forrest: Okay thank you very much Bart. I wonder if we need to - of course we don't have any more policy development on new gTLDs in this space. We do have of course proposals within the GAC for dealing with geographic names more broadly.

I don't know if we need to discuss those here given that at this stage they're proposals, given that they impact on names more broadly than country and territory names. I suppose we ought to at least put that on the agenda that we've discussed that here in terms of how it may impact future rounds.

But again these are proposals at this stage and nothing firm. Does anyone have any questions about those proposals, what we might do about them, how we record them, this sort of thing?

All right, what I suggest we do, what I suggest we do, Bart, is I would like to think that we've captured those at least in terms of an awareness that these proposals exist and perhaps reflect on how they might impact us going forward. I do think although it isn't a policy, it's a proposal. It could impact on country and territory names going forward.

I'm happy to start that. We can circulate that for the group, a brief summary of what these proposals are and how they might impact country and territory names. It could go into an updated section within our own reporting of current policies.

I say that knowing that at the time that we did the study group final report there were things that were pending, let's say, that weren't actual policies that hadn't necessarily come into effect like the, for example, the proposed IDN ccTLD overall policy. It puts us on our radar. Does anyone have any objection to that?

Bart Boswinkel: Heather, this is Bart. I just want to make a comment is as far as I'm aware, say in creating this working group, there were some conversations, and there was a concern expressed whether our own potential overlap between the say, the focus of this working group and the scope of this working group and the GAC proposals.

Probably it's my suggestion would be that first it's a good thing to monitor progress on the proposals anyway. But secondly, and maybe probably more importantly, is to check and to check whether there is overlap in scope on the two proposals.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. Bart, I agree 100%. I am concerned that as we are doing our work the GAC is doing something similar and overlapping and thus leaves our report (unintelligible) position at the end. So I agree whole-heartedly. How do you propose how best to go about that (unintelligible)?

Bart Boswinkel: As far as I know is - Olga Cavalli is member of the GAC and she's also a member observer to this working group. Let me ask her if there is any potential and if she can share the proposals.

Heather Forrest: Excellent, excellent. I think we also have to know if we could have a status report on that. It would be helpful to have that before L.A. as well - a status report to the extent that Olga is able to discuss where the GAC is in its thinking and really what the basis for its thinking is to the extent that she's able to speak to that. I think that would be very helpful.

Bart Boswinkel: And maybe in addition invite GAC members who are on this - I don't know how it's called - whether it's a working group or a committee or say in any case this group who are dealing with this, invite them for say part of the face to face meeting.

Heather Forrest: Bart, I think that would be very helpful, very helpful indeed. I'm increasingly worried that the way that this was shaping up in London there's no question there's overlap. And of course the mandate of the two groups, so to speak, is different. The mandate of the working group is to recommend if you like overall policy recommendations if we can use that term.

And the mandate of the GAC of course is to deal with GAC advice in a situation and advise the board in its own capacity under the ICANN by-laws. So I understand that we're two very different groups with two very different mandates.

However, one of the roles of this group is to monitor what's happening in this space and report based on what's happening in this space. But to the extent

that we don't have intimation about what's happening in this space, it leaves our report incomplete, if you like, and leaves us making recommendations on unsound footing, so incomplete footing.

Bart Boswinkel: Heather, Lisa has her hand up.

Heather Forrest: Lisa, yes please.

Lisa Fuhr: Lisa Fuhr for the record. I think it's a very, very good idea to find out where it's doing the same work, reporting on the proposals from GAC. But I think - wasn't GAC going to establish a secretariat that could be contacted? Because I think one of the things was that the GAC members are, they're drowning in paper and dealing directly with them might be a tough way to go. So if we can get some contact with the secretariat, I think that could be a solution.

Heather Forrest: Thank you Lisa. It's an excellent idea if we can do. I think that's a wonderful way to start. I'm less concerned about how we get information. I'm more concerned about that we get information let's say. So whatever the most effective way is to do that, I'm happy to endorse that.

Lisa Fuhr: Yeah, Lisa for the record again, but I agree with the proposal of trying to meet them in Los Angeles because I think it's very fruitful to exchange what we're doing and what they're doing face to face. That would be excellent if that was possible.

Heather Forrest: Thank you Lisa. Does anyone have any objections then to arranging this face to face meeting to the extent that we're able to do that with the GAC's busy schedule? No? Good.

Bart, could I ask your help with that? Let's see - I'm not sure where we're at with the agenda for London. I suppose it depends very much - London - L.A. It depends very much on what we get done between now and then. But I

know we have a meeting time and this sort of thing. Are we able to queue up Olga and others from this group?

Bart Boswinkel: Probably. I don't know. We have to check. So for the members of the working group on the call it's my understanding there will be a face to face meeting of this group on Thursday morning starting at half past 8:00 until 10:00, so one and a half hours.

So normally my guess is normally the GAC, if all goes well, closes or (unintelligible) communique on Wednesday. And then the pressure is a little off of the GAC, but that's normal practice. I don't know what will happen in Los Angeles.

I will contact Olga to see whether she's willing and if she can engage and involve other members of the group, of that group.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. Bart, I think that would be wonderful. If you're able to do that, I would be very grateful.

Right then, that leaves us with really the discussion on the typology unless there are any further questions about or anyone have any additions in terms of existing policy in respect to country and territory names. Could I ask just for the record -- just if we formally do this - could I ask if anyone has any further additions or changes or questions or concerns around the study group's report plus - as we've just discussed - the current GAC proposals?

Are we happy to agree that that's a fulsome list at this stage of ICANN policy proposed and existing in relation to country and territory names? Does anyone know of anything else out there that we need to include for the fulsomeness of our report? No, hearing nothing then I suppose we take silence to mean that that is indeed a fulsome baseline from which this group can work.

And with that in mind we can move on and discuss the typology developed and discussed by the study group. This was really I think safe to say the bulk of our work and indeed the most challenging in many respects.

And when we think about the typology really if you like, what we're talking about is a way to define geographic name, define country and territory name in this context. And as you can see from the very careful reporting in the final report of the study group, this was not easy. There are many options.

And in fact when we describe the typology that was put together by the study group, this is a list of possibilities. This is not an end all, be all. There's a line in the final report that says this quite well, quite clearly.

This is not an exclusive list. This is really merely a stake in the sand, so to speak, in terms of how much is out there, especially in the study group; exhausted efforts, if you like, to try and get our heads around the many things that could be considered a country or a territory name.

Does anyone have any questions in the beginning, let's say, as to how the typology was developed and how it was tested? No? All right, Bart, would you like to say anything from a staff perspective on how the typology was developed?

Bart Boswinkel: Not so much on how it was developed. I think say - what I think is that it was very valuable, and what is very valuable from a staff perspective is that the typology itself was tested as well whether it's meaningful outside the ICANN wheel and whether it's say for example governments and others had an understanding of what it included.

So fortunately, and say as a result of the MOU between ICANN and UNESCO, UNESCO was able to conduct a survey among its member states. And these are - and that's again interesting. They sent say this survey mostly

to government agency or others who are not related to the GAC representative or they are not very familiar with ICANN and what it is doing.

And I think - and that's in the final report as well - say although it's not a very representative survey due to the lack of response, etcetera, or they took too long, the (unintelligible) is at least the typology itself made sense to this outside world. And I think that's an additional value of say the work of the study group.

Heather Forrest: Thank you Bart. I agree, and I think it also underlines the challenges that the study group faced in terms of communicating the object of the typology, which is to say we were not trying - certainly the role of the study group was not to develop policy recommendations. That was quite explicit. We were simply out there to identify possible conflicts, possible areas of use of country and territory names in the DNS.

And even explaining that, let's say, to our colleagues in UNESCO was a bit of a challenge, as you say Bart. Does anyone on the call have any questions around the typology itself, around any of these categories of names that have been identified as potentially relating to or potentially giving rise to country and territory names?

All right I hear silence. Of course I would like to bring up the fact that these categories again - let's say reiterate these categories - were contentious in a sense that what got included in a category and what did not get included as a category, there was a bit of a catch-all at the end, all their languages and so forth.

This was really, as I say, the most difficult aspect of the study group's work, particularly where we left existing policy. So if I can dovetail this discussion to the discussion we just had around existing policy, existing policy largely - as we know - centers around 3166 Alpha-2 and to a lesser degree 3166 Alpha-3, which we wrote into the new gTLD program.

The remainder of these names are not names that have generally been targeted in existing policy I suspect, and I would like to hear what our GAC colleagues have to say if we can manage the face to face meeting as to their thoughts on this typology.

We have some challenges ahead here. I would like to stress from my position that this typology is by no means a starting point for or it's not a predetermined place from which we say we lock all of these names up. This is simply the study group's attempt to understand where country and territory names or how country and territory names might be used in the DNS.

And with that very limited purpose in mind, does anyone have any additions to this list? Does anyone have any amendments to this list?

Man: Lisa has her hand up Heather.

Heather Forrest: Yes.

Lisa Fuhr: Lisa Fuhr for the record. I don't have any additions or amendments to the list, but I have a question about what the purpose was of your saying on country and territory names and the six official languages of the UN. I'm not sure I understand the purpose of this.

Heather Forrest: The purpose of including that on the list, Lisa?

Lisa Fuhr: Mm-hm.

Heather Forrest: If I can offer a bit of background on that, I suppose the question came up how do we deal with country and territory names in language full stop? And you see that that is reflected in the ordering of these categories in the typology. And really it's an ordering of the study group's thinking.

The first and most obvious case was the Alpha-2 list, the 3166-1 list, which of course has been enshrined in policy for some years through the RFCs and 3166-3, a natural expansion of things. And then our thinking went to how do we deal with names? How do we deal with names more fully after we left abbreviations and acronyms and this sort of thing?

Of course in the old ICANN mentality, English language names, the first thing that comes to mind in current ICANN mentality - and I stress that in the sense that we're now internationalizing ICANN and bringing UN languages into our own work, into our transcription and our translation services - those were the six languages that immediately came to mind. It wasn't necessarily a focus exclusively on those languages.

But we considered the broader context of the use of geographic names in the outside world I suppose - ISO being one, the UN being another. And you see other examples here in the report. But there wasn't any intention on the study group's part to exclude other languages, let's say, but this was a usage within context and yet without context as well and outside the strictly ICANN context.

Lisa Fuhr: So you're excluding all but the six UN languages, or is this - because that's what...

Heather Forrest: No we have as well, we spent a fair bit of time discussing national language, discussing official languages within country. And then as you see in the report we've also discussed minority or indigenous language.

Lisa Fuhr: Oh, mm-hm. Yes but - okay, okay. So you include the national language and the six UN languages.

Heather Forrest: We have specifically in the typology. We've set out - look at the proper order here. We have the country and the territory name in six official languages.

We have commonly used local names. We have country and territory names and minority or indigenous languages.

And in terms of previous to these on the list, official long form names and official short form names, those would in many cases be in whatever your official national languages are.

Lisa Fuhr: Okay, yeah.

Heather Forrest: I think where the study group had difficulty is in when we get to things like commonly used local names, how many languages do we look for, let's say. And you see that there are examples within the final report of countries with unofficial names if you like.

And do we simply deal with what the country and the name of the country citizens call themselves? Do we deal with what other countries call this country as an unofficial name? There we start to get to endless possibilities, let's say.

Lisa Fuhr: Yes. We do, and - sorry it's Lisa for the record - and I know that's a problem but like I can imagine. And I know you've had this discussion. I just needed to be clear in my head about it further.

Like Denmark in Icelandic could be - and that's not a local Danish language, but it's actually not included in the six UN languages. So that would go through in this form of typology, and it might be an issue having Denmark in the island language or in Icelandic. So these are the kind of - yeah. I'm not going to make an issue about it because I think this is not easy to solve. So...

Bart Boswinkel: Heather this is Bart - and Lisa. If you would go to the typology and the results of the survey -- I think there is a summary in the final report - you'll find that say country names in say foreign languages is also included. I know there is - and this would cover your cases.

Lisa Fuhr: Yes it would.

Bart Boswinkel: The ones you've mentioned. But then you can go a step further again is if you would take say all languages in the world. Then it becomes (unintelligible). And I think there was an example in the final report as well that it becomes - yeah you can't sustain that. It's unsustainable as a system.

Lisa Fuhr: It is. I agree.

Bart Boswinkel: And I think...

Heather Forrest: I'm sorry Bart. Carry on.

Bart Boswinkel: What is important as well say - and probably that's the next phase for the working group as well - if you would look at it say the typology was used and was - and this is a bit of background as well - was expanded and limited to understand the issues as well.

So the original typology also included historical names. But that would be say if you would go to the issue that would be again result in issues the study group itself say thought were not relevant and did not match with say the say with the ISO-3166, which is from a cc perspective still the cause.

Woman: Mm-hm.

Bart Boswinkel: So therefore you will not see historical names for example in the list.

Lisa Fuhr: Okay.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. If I might interject and one of the primary drivers for (unintelligible) names were not included was it very difficult to capture them shy of direct contact with someone. And then the question is who is the

someone. With the UNESCO survey, it demonstrates really what are the names that we can ask about and get a verifiable response in relation to?

And to the extent that we have to go door knocking and conduct a survey on a global scale, I believe we bury ourselves in terms of the works that have to be done and how we manage that. This becomes then an ongoing and indeed quite labor intensive operation to manage these sorts of names.

Lisa Fuhr: I agree. I'm satisfied with your answer so I need no more explanation, thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thank you Lisa. It's a very good question because it exposes some of the thinking and indeed the challenges faced by the study group, how we came about this typology. Does anyone else have any questions - and forgive me, I'm (unintelligible).

Bart Boswinkel: Ron Sherwood has his hand up. Ron?

Heather Forrest: Ron.

Ron Sherwood: Yes this is Ron Sherwood. Can you tell me Bart currently - in preparation for the next round of gTLDs - do the guidelines still say that country names are protected in all languages?

Bart Boswinkel: Heather, can you answer that question? I can answer it but...

Heather Forrest: This is the - which guidelines is this from?

Bart Boswinkel: This is the applicant guide book.

Heather Forrest: Ah, the applicant guide book. The applicant guide book...

Bart Boswinkel: The footnotes in the applicant guide book.

Heather Forrest: I don't have the footnote in front of me, but the footnote exists. The footnote is still sitting in the applicant guide book, which specifically includes country and territory names from application. Now I don't recall specifically how we dealt with - we said with - how we specifically dealt with languages.

Bart Boswinkel: Well it said in all languages, hence it becomes it's in all languages without any qualification. So that one is unsustainable.

Ron Sherwood: I think there is a note somewhere that there are some 7000 languages, which that would refer to.

Bart Boswinkel: So you talked about 1.5 million names at least, maybe the double.

Heather Forrest: This is a recommendation then that's I think easy for the study group or easy for the working group to come to in light of the study group's findings, which is to say as Bart has just said, that the perpetuation of that is an unworkable -- It's probably the exact (unintelligible).

Bart Boswinkel: I see a question in (Latin) names. Two symbols are protected in English (lesson). Country codes - yeah - they are, yep. That's in English currently, although - no two characters are excluded, and I think even IDN - well I'm not sure. Heather?

Heather Forrest: You (unintelligible) if they're excluded.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Heather Forrest: Across the board. And of course three-letter characters were not. But two letters were.

Bart Boswinkel: Ron go ahead.

Ron Sherwood: This is Ron. I don't know whether it applies to us, but currently there is this discussion on two-letter second level names - two-letter names at the second level.

Heather Forrest: Thank you Ron. I think it's a very good thing, a very good issue to raise, a very good issue to raise indeed. We have - in the study group report, in the study group mandate -- focused on the use of country and territory names within the VNS.

Our principal exercise was to look at the types of strings relating to the names of the country and territory names that were used as TLDs. But I do think it's a good idea to put this onto the radar.

Bart Boswinkel: Ron and Heather, if you would look at the charter, it firmly states that say this working group is only focusing on top level domains, so not on SLDs, not on second level or lower.

Heather Forrest: Do we have scope thought to the extent that for example our discussions with the GAC, our pending discussions with the GAC and their proposals - their proposals go beyond TLD. Their proposals go down the level. And I think to the - I wouldn't like to exclude the fact that we can discuss these things.

Our recommendations might not go to these. And certainly it's not the focus of our work. However, where policy is inclusive, where policy runs across levels, I understand that that's within our scope.

Bart Boswinkel: I would be very - what's the English word...

Heather Forrest: Wary?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, now wary of going down to the level of second level domains because you enter - especially because this is a joint working group -- it might be

interesting and relevant for say the people from the GNSO and others, especially regarding gTLDs, say from the ccTLD perspective it is not relevant.

Heather Forrest: Understood, understood.

Bart Boswinkel: From a ccNSO perspective. So say although say from looking at the charter there might be an opportunity to share experience, etcetera, it is definitely out of scope of say, as you said, the recommendation, etcetera, and focus area of this working group.

Heather Forrest: Understood. Thank you Bart, and I seized on this from a GNSO mentality. But I would like to at least note in our reporting to the extent that we encounter for example these GAC proposals that run across levels to acknowledge that that one's across level.

Man: And that's another, yeah, okay.

Heather Forrest: Do we have any other questions around this policy?

Bart Boswinkel: The only thing is Patrick Jones in the chat, and that might be useful for those who are not familiar with it. I think there is a reference in the study group report on the UNGEGN World Geographical Names Database. You can have a look there. Again say we've looked into this and now I'm going on the other half say from the IDN policy, etcetera, and the fast track process.

We've looked into this one. It is not - at least until recently - it was not complete. But it does provide a good overview of say the names of countries in local languages. For example what it doesn't provide, it doesn't provide the names of all territories. Some territories which are on the ISO 3166 are not included in the UN database. The best example is Taiwan.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. May I emphasize building on that point, Bart, to say that the study group found - and perhaps this is a simple trite point but I do think it

needs to be mentioned - we found no single comprehensive list. There really is no list out there that covers all of the names in the typology. There's no list out there that indeed within some of these categories within the typology for many of these there was no list.

We lose an official updated, continuously updated list when we leave the ISO list really. Beyond that it's a matter of inquiry to find out where these things are and so forth. And that makes our job particularly challenging.

Right, so in terms of a typology, are there any further questions, any further concerns? I'll be happy to confirm the typology as a baseline for our discussions here. And again I want to emphasize this is not a baseline for a recommendation at this stage.

We are not recommending at this point in time any specific future policy in relation to all of these names or some of these names. These names are a workable set of names for our discussion in this group.

So hearing no objection, could we record then in the minutes for this call that on the basis of silence I suppose, which is not ideal, we'll confirm the typology for the group's work?

Now that said, do we have or required - this is not I suppose a vote, but do we have enough people on the call just for meaningful confirmation?

Bart Boswinkel: Heather this is Bart. This is one of the reasons we have 15 people - and I think the working group has around 25 - this is one of the reasons why we introduce say a second round of discussion and a second call for the day to seek consensus of the group.

Heather Forrest: I remember that; that's right. We've got a first call confirmation and then we've got a second call confirmation.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and that will be on the second call. So everybody's pre-warned if they have any issues and so those who are on the call do have the opportunity to raise these issues at the second call as well.

Heather Forrest: Excellent Bart. Thank you for reminding me. That's true. I forgot about that. So that's a bit more comfortable then. With that in mind and I'm hearing silence, I understand that we have our first call confirmation with typology, and I will continue this for the second call.

With that behind us then we can shift to the format for reporting in our agenda. And Bart has very kindly started the (unintelligible) list and the chairs have discussed at some length the format to the community reporting. The issue here is we wanted to make sure that we had a template that all constituencies, all SOs, ACs receive the same sorts of updates as to our work.

I know we are watched and the community is interested in what we are doing. We want to provide information in a timely way, and we want to provide information in as fulsome and consistent a way as possible across the various SOs and ACs. And with that in mind, Bart, would you like to say anything to the - Bart or Lisa - would you like to say anything to the format?

Bart Boswinkel: So you can't see it either but we uploaded the (unintelligible) and I just sent it round so we can run through it. Either Lisa or you can run us through the different sections as discussed by the co-chairs.

Heather Forrest: Lisa may I turn this to you since I'm struggling with Adobe Connect?

Lisa Fuhr: Just a second; I had it mute. Yes, I'll try to do this. It's some time ago. It was last week but maybe you can help me out with this part because you make this very good (unintelligible) but we had a discussion that we would really like to inform the community about what our discussions are and how we're doing the working methods and the processes.

Bart Boswinkel: I'll run everybody through it. So this is Bart, so going back to say the London meeting, one of the action items of the co-chairs was to develop a say and propose a format for reporting to the broader community. And they would do that at this call.

So what you see in front of you is say a first draft from the co-chairs on how a progress report could look like for the broader community. So it's not really fleshed out. It's more the structure and say includes the items. So let me run through it again, say.

First of all the purpose of the progress report, it's created to inform the community -- particularly the interested SOs and ACs -- on progress the working group made to date. One of the suggestions is to inform the, say for example, the ccNSO and the GNSO at that joint meeting on the progress so we can do it once and that the co-chairs will do this. Then the second part of this will be included in future as purpose of the progress reports.

Secondly is that inform the community on the substantive discussions of the working group. And at this stage it's fairly simple. It's around the confirmation of say of the policy that the current and that the working group will start with the policies as identified by this study group and use that as a starting point for their discussions.

And secondly - and this is the first goal and this was a bit of preempting today's outcome -- but I think that will be interesting for the community as well and the co-chairs definitely think it's interesting if at the second read the typology is confirmed that it will be used as a starting point.

So then you have a bit on the substantive parts of say the work of the working group. Then the next part will be on the working method and process followed to date. The co-chairs really want to emphasize and really want to stress that

the - say the process that has been followed is clear to the community and for example the decision-making by the working group, so it's consensus based.

It will be done in two reads of any document in order to allow all the members of the working group to express their views and get their position. And so that's more the internal, but it's probably very important externally, and also process to date what has been done to reach out - outreach steps to, for example, what we discussed today of engaging and reaching out to the GAC to engage in an out process and to check whether there's overlap, etcetera.

This would be all be part of a description of the process and finally as it is a progress report, include the next steps of the working group once it takes. So it's a high level overview of the work plan. So the community's informed what will happen next and when they can expect for example a first report for public comments by the group. So that's more or less the framework for progress reports. So as you'll see and if you check your e-mails you will see it.

It already has some substantive - it needs more flesh to the bones which again my suggestion would be that say that (unintelligible) will provide this through the co-chairs so they can have a look and so the working group has a document to discuss from and that would be something for the next meeting is my guess. So that's my run-through of the (unintelligible). Over to you Heather and Lisa.

Heather Forrest: Thank you Bart very much. Thank you Lisa as well. Does anyone have any questions about the format for the report?

Lisa Fuhr: Heather it's Lisa. I have a short comment to Bart's explanation. So in short what we want to do next meeting was to have this face to face meeting with the two councils - the ccNSO and GNSO - and we would make this report public on the Web site.

Heather Forrest: My understanding is that this report is our reporting to not only the ccNSO and the GNSO but to all constituencies involved and yes, and then it would go public on the Web site. So for all of our representatives in this group, they would take that back and use that -- hence the benefit of consistency for reporting back to their SO or AC. Any objections to that? No?

I submitted some comments through to you Bart earlier today or earlier yesterday I suppose my time, just in terms of our use of words around reaffirmation of policies.

Bart Boswinkel: Heather I've been through that already. This is - so what the working group sees is say the one that you've amended and updated.

Heather Forrest: Fantastic, fantastic. That's great, thank you very much. And really my comments to our original draft of this was simply going to the point of emphasizing all the context here, which is to say that the policies and the typology are a starting point for us. They by no means determine our outcome.

Bart Boswinkel: Ron has his hand up. Ron go ahead.

Ron Sherwood: Yes Bart. Could you post for us a link to the location where we have a list of the people, the members of this group and the constituencies that they are from or represent? Is all of this information in one location for example?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes it's under ccNSO web site. If you would go to the working groups you will find a reference to the working group. And this is where you see everybody listed.

Ron Sherwood: Again yes but does everybody on this meeting today have access to that location (unintelligible)?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah it's the public Web site of the ccNSO.

Ron Sherwood: Okay thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. To Ron's point there's also a weekly page on the GNSO site and I found a link to the membership page. I just noted that we do need to make a couple of updates because I think we had some additions to the group from the last time we updated the Web site. And we'll take care of that shortly.

But that contains as well the same information as well as some other background information as well as the charter and (unintelligible) information as well as a link to the ccNSO workspace and the (unintelligible).

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. May I follow up with Marika's because I don't that this is the discussion that we had in the broader group. I asked the question - and I don't think I was alone in the thinking as to why this sitting on the ccNSO page and just for everyone to hear and understand the response. I understand that this is really an administrative convenience Bart with what you explained...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Heather Forrest: ...that the study group had been a ccNSO creation and that those resources were already in place in terms of the page for the study group on the ccNSO page. And for administrative convenience the ccNSO has kindly offered to continue its role let's say in maintaining the public space for this. And then as Marika points out, the GNSO has the linking page.

Bart Boswinkel: But you'll see Heather this is not just for this working group. But this also the case for other cross-community working groups.

Heather Forrest: It's very helpful Bart. I think we're grateful to you for your ccNSO's role in this -- houses and keep track of all this and put the public face on it. Are there any further questions around the reporting that we'll undertake?

Bart Boswinkel: Ron do you still have your hand up or is it no question?

Man: Excuse me. Maybe it's (unintelligible).

Bart Boswinkel: I don't see any other questions in the Adobe Heather.

Heather Forrest: Excellent, excellent. Thank you all. Thank you Bart. Our next meeting - I turned to the group clearly on this. We said we would meet regularly before - between L.A. and London. And we've been making these calls a monthly event to the extent possible around summer holidays and these sorts of things.

We would like to have a call in - what are we now - we're August now. We'd like to have a call in September. Can I turn to Bart or to staff to guide us in how we might go about doing this? Do we want to do the fall?

Bart Boswinkel: I think probably in four weeks' time and we'll run a (unintelligible) for the working group.

Heather Forrest: Excellent, excellent. With that, we've come to the end of our agenda. Does anyone have any other issues, concerns, questions that they would like to raise at this stage?

Bart Boswinkel: (Mary Udama) has her hand up. (Mary)? (Mary) is typing. The progress report will be made public if that's your question, and the work of the group as well. So that's what we said - the progress report will be made public and it will be probably sent - and I invite everybody on the working group to send it to their colleagues with an interest in the topic. Any other questions? No. Heather over to you to close it.

Heather Forrest: Excellent, excellent. Well, thank you very much everyone for joining today's meeting. On behalf of the four co-chairs I'm grateful to you for joining us. I look forward to speaking with you in our next meeting in roughly four weeks' time. And thank you very much again to the staff for their excellent support of our work. Excellent.

Woman: Thanks everyone.

Man: Bye-bye.

Heather Forrest: Bye everyone.

Woman: Bye.

Recording: This has been adjourned. Please disconnect all remaining lines and thank you very much for joining. You can please stop the recording.

Man: This now concludes today's conference. The recordings have now been stopped.

END