

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

Monday 04 May 2015 at 1100 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-review-04may15-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

ccNSO

Ron Sherwood, .vi
Annebeth Lange, .no (Co-Chair)
Joke Braeken, .eu
Mirjana Tasic, .rs
Grigori Saghyan, .am
Mary Uduma, ng

GNSO

Heather Forrest, IPC (Co-Chair)
Carlos Raul Gutierrez, NPOC
Maxim Alzoba, NTAG

At-Large
Cheryl Langdon-Orr
Jordi Iparraguirre

ISO
Jaap Akkerhuis

GAC
Olga Cavalli
Brian Beckham – WIPO, GAC observer
Tom Dale – GAC Secretariat

Apologies: Sonigitu Ekpe, NCUC

ICANN staff:

Bart Boswinkel

Lars Hoffman

Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Recordings are started, you may proceed.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Kathy). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody, and welcome to the CCWG on the Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs on the 4th of May, 2015.

On the call today we have Heather Forrest, Olga Cavalli, Carlos Raul Gutierrez, Ron Sherwood, (unintelligible), Tom Dale, Joke Braeken, Maxim Alzoba, Mirjana Tasic and Brian Beckham.

We received an apology from (unintelligible). And from staff we have Bart Boswinkel, Lars Hoffman and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you every so much and over to you, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Wonderful. Thank you very much, Nathalie and thank you to all of you folks for being on the call. Welcome. This is our regular meeting of the Cross Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs.

We have in our attendees today two of the co-chairs; we're missing two unfortunately the two that we are missing are both from the ccNSO but I'm hopeful that Annebeth will join, if not Paul. And Bart we'll, perhaps ask you at times and other members of the ccNSO to speak up if we need to if we don't have Annebeth. I'm conscious that not having our two ccNSO co-chairs makes it a little bit less than ideal. But again I hope we will have Annebeth shortly.

With that in mind, and I see maybe we're chasing down Annebeth so that's good. With that in mind we've got some disturbance on the line, hopefully it's not on my end. If you do think it is someone please send a message.

I would like to acknowledge that we have some members from the GAC on the call with us today and welcome. We are delighted to have you and appreciate Olga, in particular, reaching out and wanting to be part of today's meeting.

Our invitation for today's meeting, as have previous invitations, been circulated to the GAC and to the full membership of the GAC to ensure that our work is communicated to them. And I understand scheduling and we're all rather busy dealing with the IANA transition and this sort of thing but to give everyone a full opportunity to participate in this group.

With that in mind, and with the addition of folks on the call that haven't previously been on our calls since Singapore, we've added at last minute to the agenda, an overview of the discussion so far. We won't take very much time for that given - pardon me - that we hadn't really prepared on that. But we will - we'll do that in - as best we can.

With that in mind, where we are since Singapore, in Singapore we agreed to proceed on the work on the basis of what we called at that point a strawman options paper. And that paper set out a - our models. I see Nathalie's note that Annebeth has joined the call. Annebeth, welcome, thank you. I'm sorry we waited for you but thought it best to proceed so I'm delighted that you're on the call. And I'm just offering an update in light of the fact that we have new members or folks that haven't been on the call since Singapore offering a bit of an update.

We decided to proceed in Singapore on the basis of what we were calling a strawman options paper which is the document that you see in front of you on

the screen in the Adobe Connect. That document is now version 1 May 2015. We've added the versions to add some version control to this. And we've been through a fair number of changes since Singapore.

Most notably the structure of the document, in addition to substance. I don't mean to suggest we haven't proceeded with substance. But the structure of the document is significantly more clear and we've made some significant efforts to provide background documentation - background in respect of our work as a CWG, background more generally in respect of the use of country and territory names and policies surrounding the use of country and territory names in the DNS.

And in doing so we've relied on existing work primarily, we're not reinventing the wheel as such but merely demonstrating our knowledge of the wealth of information that has come before us on this topic.

Jaap very helpfully commenced that effort in regards to the background and context. And I recently have added information to that in relation to the GAC principles, in relation to the GNSO's efforts in the reserve names working group and really the preparation leading up to and then comprising the - I see, Jaap, I see your note so I'm going to turn my microphone down and see if that helps. Let me know if that's better.

The work comprising the definition in the Applicant Guidebook and - perfect, thank you, Jaap - and the way that country and territory names were treated. With that in mind that information has gone into this version that you see in front of you. I've circulated my comments, my additions to the draft which I agreed to undertake in our previous call two weeks ago.

So the things that we had agreed on at that time that I should - that let's say I agreed to - I agreed to pursue, were adding in that additional context, making - removing any references to I and this sort of thing, so de-personalizing it, filling in gaps as we went. And also removing from the definitions table

anything that perhaps wasn't best characterized as a definition and putting it into the substance of the document.

Now that we have a clearer structure in terms of the substance, some of those things that were sitting in definitions much more logically sat within the substance.

So I have attempted to do those things. I circulated my draft, I believe on the 24th of May. And the version that you have in front of you is 1 May. And, Lars, may I ask you just for clarification the differences, let's say not detailed, but between the version that I've put up a list and this 1 May version what's been done. Sorry, Bart, yes you're right, 24 April, you're quite right.

Lars Hoffman: Sorry, Heather, I was just on mute. I've just done a couple of non-substantive editing, added a couple of comments and did a few clarifications. So that is what's changed since the last version, nothing dramatic has changed.

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: Fantastic, Lars, thank you very much. That's just for clarification purposes. And I see Olga and perhaps Jaap are having trouble with the audio. We'll carry on but I hope that they'll - yeah, I hope they'll be able to join us in a substantive way soon. Jaap is in better shape. And Olga we'll dial out to you.

I should make some clarifications. I guess we discussed it as co-chairs who should chair this meeting and for a variety of reasons some having to do with time zone but more really having to do with the substance, seeing as how I was the one that carried out those changes to the document following our previous meeting I volunteered to chair the meeting in the sense that it would give me an opportunity to explain what's been done.

One point of explanation, which I believe I put in my covering email, is I did not remove any of the comments that were sitting in the document as of our

last meeting, which I believe was the 21st of April. I intentionally didn't remove any comments because I wanted really to test - they need to be there as a record and to test whether the changes that have been made were satisfactory in terms of addressing those comments.

So with that in mind, that's a bit of a background as to where we've been. And perhaps I say a few words about where we're going and then open for questions or comments.

Where we're going is we're progressing with this document, as you can see in today's agenda, we're reviewing this current version and in particular focusing our time on the definitions and on the first section - substantive section of the paper which is the discussion of two-letter strings. And one of the things that I was asked to do was to recalibrate the options table at the end of that section on two-letter strings to reflect our discussion that we had in our last meeting.

We are progressing with this document dealing first with two letter strings and then hopefully the analysis in relation to those two letter strings will help to inform our work in relation to three letter strings. So that is the path forward as we all understand it.

I'm very happy now to open up the floor if anyone has any questions, comments, concerns please by all means raise those now. It's a very good opportunity to do that. And hopefully we have everyone on the line. Jaap, marvelous, and, Bart, your hand is up. Please go ahead, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Hello, Heather, hello all. Unfortunately I didn't have, due to the other work, I didn't have really the time to run through the text you've edited. But what say going through it this morning before the call in preparation of the call, I think, say, where we started was sketching a bit of a history around ISO 3166 and producing a bit of language.

And based on the conversation I think you've added a lot of language including the references to some of the RFC which is almost a historical overview of the evolution of, say, the use of and the evolution of the top level domain system as such, how top level domains have increased, etcetera.

So it's - what I found reading this is there are two or three different goals almost in the historical in the overview. Might it be useful to separate or include a kind of distinction between the different purposes like, let me give you example, so in the text you've edited you start with the different RFCs and what I did not see, and probably which is currently the - I would say the stable version on which the, say, especially for the ccTLDs, which is relevant, RFC 1591 and the language included in RFC 1591 around the use of ISO 3166 is not included.

On the other hand what you see is the reference to the GAC principles on new gTLDs and specifically to the use of country names. But there is also some historical work done by the ccNSO. So my suggestion would be to maybe, say, separate a bit around, say, the new gTLD process and what that has, say, and its consequences on, say, the activities of the different groups and do a bit of - and make it more fulsome, the historical overview including maybe as a subsection or maybe even as a more of an annex but something to guide the readers around the, say, how ISO 3166 works and use the right terminology.

Heather Forrest: Bart, thank you for those comments, they're very very helpful. And in terms of the ccNSO perspective of course we lean on you and Annebeth and other colleagues in the ccNSO to provide that fulsome background. I suppose I took things forward to the extent that I thought there was information. And I tried to fill in some gaps, let's say, in what Jaap provided in terms of a bit more information as you suggest. I can't say I necessarily had multiple purposes in mind but I do very much see what you're saying. Jaap, please go ahead.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Well, I think some of my comments, I mean, just like the one Bart is saying that - there's some echo on the line that I hear but I hope. Not sure whether you are just saying the historical things and how things work now.

As an example (unintelligible) about the statistical bulletin. But this is not how it works nowadays, I mean, (unintelligible) statistical bulletin didn't appear since 1995 so that's 20 years old information, what is there.

And (unintelligible) some of these things where I said well, you know, it might be - it might be historically correct but it's not how it works now. And the - what you see all the time is people are confusing how things used to work and how things work nowadays. And so it makes things, yeah, very imprecise, I mean, that's what I'm saying. It makes, I mean, apart - and then there are quite some other around - other mistakes which needs to be cleaned up.

I mean, as an example, (unintelligible) something about post-IANA. I guess they mean post (unintelligible) there because IANA is still alive and kicking as far as I know. And there are a lot of small things which has - which - actually changes the meaning from reality. I mean, I actually - I got this text quite late, I only had 1 May version but I have quite some comments and might be too detailed to go into that now. But I really - it really needs some revision of the details. (Unintelligible) made really sure that that is current and what has used to be.

Heather Forrest: Thank you very much, Jaap. It's very, very helpful. Your input has been helpful all along. What I suggest perhaps that we do is not just comments in order to progress the work what I would suggest is that we work on new versions, that if you have changes please make them in the text and send them to Lars. I suspect Lars is happy to deal with that.

I was concerned in the last meeting that, you know, we've got comments in the margin and we're not really progressing the draft. And I, by no means,

you know, have all of the details here. This isn't my document, it's the CWG's document. So we need to step up and make some additions to the document and revisions, Bart, Annebeth, ccNSO colleagues, I am hopeful that you can do that from a ccNSO perspective and, Jaap, very much from a currency perspective. The intention of this exercise is to get it right, let's say.

Bart, I see your hand and then followed by Carlos.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, I just want to suggest, say, what you - wanted to suggest what you were saying, say, let me take, say, although I'm staff, say together with Annebeth and, say, under the direction of Annebeth I'll take a pass of it and insert what I think is, say, that happened in the ccNSO with this regard and maybe together with Jaap do some, you know, have a look at the factual background on ISO, etcetera, and have it to you, say, before the next call.

Heather Forrest: That's excellent, Bart. Thank you very much. And, Annebeth as well. Carlos, please go ahead.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes, this is Carlos for the record. Good morning to everybody. Thank you very much, Jaap, and Bart, for the comments. It is a great work what Heather has done. And I see at least three main lines of argument in the new version of the document. First line is the country codes and how they have been managed by the ccTLDs.

The second line happens with the new gTLDs where they go a step further and they start talking about geographic and geopolitical names, as we know, they start including cities and other stuff and so it happens in the Applicant Guidebook.

And then there is the third line of argument or the third step in the ccNSO document where they also include other representations of country names. And it's very important to keep that in mind and when we revised the document we should keep it in mind and keep it clearly or ask ourselves how

to deal with the three expansion steps, as I would say, because we have looked carefully at the definitions and yes, we have these different boundaries of the discussion that may be somebody who has not been in all the conversations won't be aware of.

And we have to bring it into the document and make clear it's within the scope of the charter of this new cross community working group because it has been expanding in a way and now that Olga is here and she has been also doing a great job on the country names from the side of the GAC, we have to be very careful to show where we are exactly within those boundaries. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Carlos, very much for your comments. And indeed it picks up on I think a notion that came out of our call last week but I did try to capture within the historical context. And perhaps that's also in - lurking behind Bart's feedback as well is that and I was trying to anticipate that we have to go beyond codes in our context, our context shouldn't be limited to the ISO list so we need to go a bit further.

Annebeth, please, go ahead. Annebeth, I'm not sure if you were speaking, you might be on mute. I'll just type a message to Annebeth. And I have a significant delay on my Adobe Connect. I'm not sure - so my message might be slow to appear. Annebeth, do we have you by any chance? No.

Nathalie, may I trouble you - my message to Annebeth has posted. Can we post a message to Annebeth to say can she hear us. Oh, Annebeth, good, typing. We'll give Annebeth a second to see if we can't get her comments in. No, Annebeth, we cannot hear you.

What I propose we do, I suppose, is if - I don't want to lose...

Annebeth Lange: Can you hear me now?

Heather Forrest: Oh, Annebeth, perfect.

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: Excellent. Yes.

Annebeth Lange: Good, good.

Heather Forrest: Marvelous. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Here I am. Well actually I agree on everything that's been said. And it's very useful if Jaap could elaborate a little. And I think the separation of these things would be very useful. And also to be careful not to take too much of the history in - and forget what we are doing today even if it gives us the whole picture.

What I really wanted to comment about is that we have to be really careful to get the right definitions at this time. And my question is in the definitions section about where we try to define the country and territory names. So there you'll put up - you referred to the term country and territory names in the definition that was made in Module 2 in the Applicant Guidebook.

And also you put in a section (unintelligible) discussion where you take out the study of the - the WIPO study of country names. And my question actually is that we use (unintelligible) in the work with new gTLDs to find a definition for the country and territory names in the Applicant Guidebook.

And this definition has actually gone through the board already so why should we go away from that? Should we try to find a whole new definition and why not go on with the thing that we used so long time to discuss? Any comments on that, Heather?

Heather Forrest: Annebeth, thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: No, it's a very good question. I did not necessarily intend to remove the WIPO definition which had been put in in the previous version. That definition was put in as a talking point. And Carlos spoke to the definition. My intention in that, and if we can scroll to definitions that would probably be the best thing.

It - my intention was to say that the actual definition that we use is for discussion. I was not in any way precluding the use of any particular definition be it the definition that's found in the Applicant Guidebook, the definition that's found - that's adopted by WIPO. Really my principle here was to say that it came out of our previous call.

And it was a point that I made that there were, in some instances, and perhaps country and territory names is not the best example, but there were in some instances places where there was a definition used in the past and potentially that the group would consider adopting a new definition. As I say, Carlos spoke to this point and Carlos, I might ask you if you're willing to speak to it again, this notion of what definition we adopt and if you want to speak directly on the WIPO definition as well.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Thank you, Heather. This is Carlos again. No, that was just a reference to have a definition. And as I said, this is a definition only of country and territory names so the definition close to our working group. As I noticed the Applicant Guidebook has a wider definition that will cover our definition but also includes other ones. And I just want to make clear that there are different boundaries.

And I feel that our group was chartered on country names only and does not include cities or regions which are not on the ISO list etcetera, etcetera. So I don't think we can live under just one definition, we have one definition for

this chartered working group and we have to be aware that when we move to other groups or boundaries that we might be out of our charter.

So we will have to live with the multiple definitions, some have historical reasons, some are, as said, boundaries to us. I'm not trying to push for any one. I just want to make clear that this working group is dealing with country codes because the background is the ISO list and that excludes cities, that excludes provinces, that excludes rivers, whatever.

Heather Forrest: Thank you very much, Carlos. That's helpful. Bart and then Annebeth please.

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart. Say, based on, say, experience might it be useful to keep an evolving list of definitions the working group will use over time so that staff will record definitions as they come up but not include it in the main text yet but, say, in a separate document as a kind of terminology list or glossary that evolves with the progression of the working group itself.

Heather Forrest: Bart, I think this is - and this is Heather. I think that's an excellent idea. And that in and of itself, let's say, captures the evolution of this working group's discussion. And then thus the final version, whatever we agree to, would end up in the final version of the document but there would be a history of that discussion. I see Carlos has - and agreed with that and that's very helpful.

I wouldn't, let's say, I see Carlos's comments. Let's say, my intention in the actual definition section wasn't necessarily, as Carlos said, wasn't to push for one definition or another but where a term has already been defined I think it's helpful to identify that that term has been defined and identify what that definition is.

It makes it very easy then should the CWG wish to adopt that existing definition, that's helpful. But we did acknowledge in our previous - in our previous call that there was a great deal of inconsistency and how terms were used. And we wanted to address that and this is perhaps one way to do that.

Annebeth, please, go ahead.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you. It's Annebeth here. I agree with Bart's suggestion, that might be really useful. But at the same time I think that we must remember that this is a group working with country and territory names, not only codes. And in this definition we are defining country and territory names. And, again, as we have discussed so many times before, the territory in this connection, not the same as all regions in the world, it's the special kind of (unintelligible) that's - it's connected to country some instances originated from the ISO list.

And since this is an ICANN working group and not a WIPO working group, I find it kind of strange that we move away from some definition that's been - we've been working a long time earlier to define. So but it's okay for me to have an evolution so we see all the discussions going on. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Annebeth, very much. I suppose the challenge with this, it's ironic, it's the first name in our list and we spent the better part of our call two weeks ago on this definition as well and discuss ideas. And I had initially an idea about how this could be done and was very quickly convinced that that wasn't the way to be done.

That idea went to we define country and then define territory and that picked up on the comments that you just made, Annebeth, about the particular use of territory. Whatever definition it is that we adopt needs to encapsulate both of those things, let's say, so it needs to be a fulsome definition. And I'm not convinced, let's say, this is very much a strawman and, let's say, I haven't put anything after the colon, you know, of what we adopt.

So I welcome - in order to progress this - I can't emphasize this enough - I think we need to have - we need to have suggestions rather than comments in the margin to the extent that we each drafted our own definition of this term

and sent those along then that would be - that would be a starting point for discussion, let's say.

As I understand it the WIPO definition was only put in here to provoke discussion, was put in here to get us to talk and see what other areas and other bodies were defining this term, see how other bodies were defining this term. So with that in mind, and in the spirit of discussion, I think we need some suggestions here. I'm seeing two discuss - drafts to discuss. Does that sound helpful? Annebeth, I see your hand is up. Is that - please, go right ahead.

Annebeth Lange: No, it's - no it's okay.

Heather Forrest: It's the proverbial old hand that exists in ICANN.

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: It's an old hand.

Heather Forrest: Very good. Very good. Is anyone opposed - always better to ask if anyone says no. Is anyone opposed to the idea, let's go (unintelligible) and on this country and territory names before our next call. If you feel strongly about a particular definition or indeed if you feel strongly about the adoption of - perhaps that's a point for discussion.

So first point, let's close that off. If you feel very strongly about a particular wording and would like to propose that, please do so. Send it to the group. It will be captured in the ongoing discussion and it'll be put into the draft for discussion in our next call.

Point 2, if you feel very strongly that the term country and territory names should be defined as it is defined in the Applicant Guidebook, please I welcome those comments now. This is an excellent time to talk about that

because that is in fact a definition that we had, you know, and it can be discussed. Is there anyone that wishes to speak to that, to the adoption of the definition in the Applicant Guidebook? Annebeth, you made some comments along those lines, I'm not sure if you want to say anything more to start us.

Annebeth Lange: It's Annebeth again. I can (unintelligible) but as you understand I feel that this is the best definition for this group. And I've said it - that before, but we have to be really certain that all people understand there is a difference between territory (unintelligible) in this connection and regions and areas in other connections because that's not into our group at all; it's outside our mandate.

Heather Forrest: Annebeth, thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: And quite right, we've been very careful to be mindful of our mandate.

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: Yeah, no we hear you. Not to worry. And I fully agree, whatever definition we adopt it would be foolish of us for that definition to go beyond our mandate. We do know that the definition in the Applicant Guidebook is the definition - let's say is within our mandate so that's already an assurance.

Perhaps, again, I pose the question in the negative in order to spark discussion because I don't see any other hands. Is there anyone vehemently opposed to the adoption of the definition of country and territory names in the Applicant Guidebook?

Silence on that front. Well I suppose then I'll put that out for...

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: Yes, please.

Bart Boswinkel: Carlos and Jaap have put their hand up. Carlos is the first one.

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: Thank you. I have a delay on my Adobe. Thank you. Carlos, please go ahead.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: So I think you have put the finger on a very important point. I think this is one question we have to address is the working group within the definition of the Applicant Guidebook. We have not put the definition of the Applicant Guidebook in the definitions list yet. And I think it's worth the discussion. Thank you, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Carlos. Jaap, please.

Jaap Akkerhuis: I want to caution a bit about this. I mean, if you are talking about country codes, I mean, in respect to ISO 3166, I mean, this not really - it might be confusing to have different definition than ISO uses itself. And so maybe we are talking about different things and not just about country code domains.

And because the Applicant Guidebook definition talks about - uses the name ccTLD, not only for country codes. So - but also for things like internationalized domain names. So that might bite each other. And so maybe we should find a different term for what we now call actually country code TLDs and come up with slightly more wider term and that doesn't have this notation with the ISO 3166 directly attached to it.

Heather Forrest: Jaap, this is Heather. Just to clarify, are you suggesting we have a new definition for ccTLD? I didn't quite understand the full extent of your comment.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Well, yes, just (unintelligible) pops up. But, I mean, if you look at what the Applicant Guidebook means with the ccTLD it means not only things which I mentioned in the ISO standard, but is also just uses the ISO standard as a base for getting other things like international domain names in - as a country code TLD.

So it might help really make difference between what Applicant Guidebook is trying to say and what the standard itself says.

Heather Forrest: Thank you very much, Jaap. And I certainly agree. My only hesitation with adopting the definition of country and territory names as it is set out in the Applicant Guidebook is to the extent that anything needs to be clarified we lose that opportunity.

Jaap, do you see that this can be handled - the point that you raise in the definition that comes after country and territory names which is country codes or is something else needed let's say, in terms of the definition of ccTLD? How mechanically do we do this I suppose is my question?

Jaap Akkerhuis: (Unintelligible) it is just (unintelligible), I mean, now we talk about it. So I don't have the proposal in the moment but it is just something to think about that - that this, I mean, there is a difference if you talk strictly about the country codes according to 3166 and to the more wider connotation, the Applicant Guidebook is using.

And as long as we make that clear to the people who are reading that, I mean, there is - we might - we (unintelligible) different having the confusion. It's just a thought.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Jaap. No, I agree, this is definitely our opportunity to clarify on points that haven't, to now, haven't to now been clear. So what I would propose is that we add that to the to-do list that someone be brave and try and attempt some wording and put it in a spot that they think is appropriate.

It's probably difficult to do that on the fly. So perhaps we do that in the next round of changes.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yeah. The same discussion came - not the same but a similar discussion came up on an IETF list this weekend where people are trying to write a document clarifying some of the terminology used in the DNS protocol. And people have a problem and separating the fact that the protocol doesn't dictate the policy - the name space policy and the other way around. So there was a lot of confusion getting on for the last two weeks.

And it is something we want probably to avoid as well, again, that's to prevent further confusion in the discussion.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Jaap. I think that's a very laudable aim. And if we all survive the CWG and if we can contribute some clarity to this otherwise very, very muddy situation I think we all get gold stars and we should all retire from ICANN while we're ahead.

I see Nathalie's comment. Mary, welcome, thank you very much for joining us.

Would anyone like to add some comments to this discussion about the definition of - or let's say the definition from the Applicant Guidebook and any concerns or clarity issues. I agree with Annebeth's comment that we really understand the provocation for our CWG and I hope that that comes out in the context of the study group and the context of the CWG that's set out in paper to try and deal with - provide some future guidance in terms of responding to the ineligibility of country and territory names in Round 1 of the new gTLD program. So I agree that that is indeed our starting point.

And to the extent that we diverge from the Applicant Guidebook, to the extent that we refine that definition or explain that definition I think it would behoove

us, as Jaap suggests, to take that opportunity to explain what it is that we're doing. Any other concerns? No?

Hearing none, and I confess let's say if anyone does have a comment my Adobe is very, very slow. Please just speak up, it's probably the best way to do it because I don't see any hands. So if I'm missing a hand please speak up.

On the definitions relating to ISO I wonder if anyone has thoughts or discomfort about that information having been moved out. I'm thinking specifically things like how are the ISO code structure, purpose of ISO codes, what is the connection, this sort of thing.

Those are - those are more discussion points I guess than definitions as such. If anyone has any discomfort with that having been moved out - and I didn't change the text, I simply moved it out of definitions to a discussion of ISO - and put that down into two-letter codes. If anyone has any concerns about that it would be helpful to hear those.

No, no concerns, hearing none...

Bart Boswinkel: Heather, Heather this is Bart.

Heather Forrest: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: You can't see my hand. I think what is worth it, and maybe, as I said I will take, together with Annebeth, I will take a (unintelligible) for it, say, depends a bit on the purpose. I think the original goal, for example, from Jaap to provide an overview of say maybe the historical and current practices of the ISO 3166 is in itself already very helpful for the broader community.

And using and maybe keeping a list of definitions parallel to the strawman at this stage, say, the result of that piece of text and the definition used by ISO

3166 could then end up in that parallel text. But I think in itself just explaining how ISO treated and has been treating country and territories is one, as a separate item so restructuring it a little bit again.

But that, say, as I said, I'll propose something for the next call together with Annebeth.

Heather Forrest: Fantastic, Bart, thank you. That's very, very helpful. I think - I think we're in a good position in a sense that if we have folks who are brave enough to tackle the document and make changes nothing is sacred so I think that would be very helpful. I too struggled with where to put that information, where did it rationally sit. And I think there will be comments about the purpose of that information they're entirely sensible. So I think that's a wonderful thing if you're willing to work with Annebeth to push that draft forward. And we have other ccNSO colleagues on the call and that would be very helpful.

And perhaps that even suggests an interesting way to go forward is that if we have the ccNSO members work together to come up with some revisions and then perhaps we have some collaboration between GNSO members, not to say that anyone would be excluded from those discussions but so that we have - we have all input provided and we have Olga and other GAC members who are interested in our work.

And at some point when we have our own story straight, if you like that we pass that on to our colleagues in the GAC to show them where we are and ensure that we haven't misrepresented anything in relation to the GAC principles and so on and so forth.

At that point - and not seeing any hands but bearing in mind that I see hands about two minutes after folks start talking, Olga, would you - have you on the call and I don't in any way intend to put you on the spot, I wonder if you have any comments as to anything that's been said up to now?

Olga Cavalli: Hello, Heather. Can you hear me? This is Olga.

Heather Forrest: Yes, yes indeed, Olga. Thank you. Go ahead.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you. Thank you all very much. This is Olga Cavalli from the GAC for the record. And I know that we have changed the time of the call because if not it would have been in the middle of the night for me and so I really appreciate that.

This is one of the facts that sometimes prevented me for my participation in the calls. And also there has been a considerable amount of calls especially I'm involved in the Accountability Working Group. So my apologies for not joining before.

I've been listening to the discussion about definitions. And I think it's very - it's quite important. And if you recall in the open session we had in Singapore that I - that we invited you to give your perspectives about the document that we are working on in the GAC. It's - I think our works are perfectly complementary.

I think that you're focusing exactly on some defined list whether it's a definition by the WIPO or by the ISO or maybe including also the Applicant Guidebook, I don't know how well the document finally look like as it's evolving.

But I think that we are exactly focusing in our working group - internal working group in the GAC in everything that is not included in those lists. So I thought and I was checking with Tom Dale that it's also kindly joining us and from GAC secretariat and maybe we could include if you allow us in our working document, your definition about for what is for your working group a geographic name and a country name and a territory name. And so we can focus clearly and what is not included there.

So that is my comment for the moment. I have, as you know, encouraged other members of the GAC to join. It is extremely challenging now so several of us are working in different parts of the IANA transition working groups as members or as participants. So this is why I think we are not getting so much participants in this call. But I am here.

And what I tried to do - what I will try to do from now on, being the chair of the working group on geo names in the GAC, I will summarize this call and the discussion about the document and I will share with our working group members in the GAC so we keep more connected and more coordinated. So that's my comment for the moment. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Olga, thank you very much. And I would say if you can perhaps it's helpful to wait 24 or 48 hours or so to provide your summary in that it could then be attached to the transcript from our call. We circulate the transcripts rather soon after the call or the recording - links to the recording. And that way anyone who was interested could go back to that and, you know, if they wanted more information rather than trouble you, let's say, they could have a direct link to that.

May I also ask, and this I fear I put you on the spot, but not for now, would you be willing to provide us in our next meeting in two weeks' time, an update on where your working group is at so that we have a better picture before Buenos Aires of what each side is doing.

Olga Cavalli: May I comment?

Heather Forrest: Yes please.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Heather. Yes, I can give you a brief overview now and we - of course I can provide you a more detailed one in two weeks. We have prepared a new part of the draft document that includes all the legal concerns

that were raised in the public comment period. And as you know there were many.

And kindly Tom and Michelle from (ACIC) have been summarizing that, that will be part of the draft document. So we will have the two positions, the one that's more restricted from the legal point of view and the one that includes the concerns from community.

Then what we noticed, is that there - most of the comments, even those that were in favor or against, are aiming for a definition of public interest. So we will go into that. We would try to find into the ICANN work documents and other things and also work within the group of how to define public interest and also review the community applications somehow. And I think that's for the moment.

We still have to go within the working group to discuss the priority of this new additions to the document and to this - reviewing these definitions on defining the definition. So that's more or less the idea for the next month.

We will have some outcomes that we will present during Buenos Aires in one session, and I think it's on Tuesday so if you want to join. As you know, the sessions are open. It will not be kind of a panel discussion as the other meeting in Singapore because now we will have internal work. But of course you are able to join us and maybe share with us after the meeting some of views or of course through email.

So my idea is to coordinate more closely with your cross community working group so we are not on the same page but we do both our work in a complementary work. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Olga. Annebeth, please, and you'll have the final word for tonight because we're 2 minutes to 10 or in my time.

Annebeth Lange: Okay, thank you. Annebeth here. Olga, thank you very much for joining us.

That's very useful. And we are really glad that you are there with the other people from the GAC. And just one comment, I won't (unintelligible) but I see now that some of the confusion between the discussions with the Carlos and myself and some others about the definition in the Applicant Guidebook is that in the text is included the whole chapter on geographical names.

And that's what - not what I mean the definition. Is only the section (2.2.4.1.1) that's dealing with country and territory names. The rest of it is not in our mandate at all. So we have to be clear on that. And thank you very much.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: That's a very good point. Thank you to both of you. In light of the time if there is anyone that has any further comments or concerns given the slow appearance of my hands, I'll be quite for a few seconds if anyone wishes to speak.

Annebeth Lange: Heather, thank you very much for leading the call. It's - you do it a beautiful way so it's much better for all of us. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: I don't know about that, Annebeth. We're in a reasonable time zone here, we're not in the middle of the night although I have to tell you, Olga, 9 times out of 10 this call wakes me up in the morning so, yeah, or in the middle of the night so I can well understand your reluctance.

With that in mind, everyone, I am - I'm very grateful for the robust discussion we've had again today. We're not progressing rapidly but we are progressing and I think that's that matters in this difficult issue. No one expected that this would be tackled in a day. And I think we're making good progress and have

evidence to take to Buenos Aires to the community that we are indeed progressing on this. So thank you very much.

Just as a recap, Bart, Annebeth, ccNSO colleagues, you'll work on this document to better reflect, more accurately reflect the ccNSO background in this area and we can lean heavily on the study group report to the extent that that helps. And, Jaap, you'll help us with ensuring that we have the current perspective, not just the historical perspective, that'd be very very helpful. Please try to limit comments in the margin and make substantive changes to text which we can deal with more than happy to deal with those.

With that in mind you'll receive an announcement in - shortly, let's say, to invite you to the next meeting which will take place in two weeks' time. And in the meantime please post your new versions and your revisions to the list. That being all, I thank you for being here and look forward to talking to you in the next meeting and in the meantime on the list. Thanks very much, everyone.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, everyone.

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much...

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: You may now stop the recordings. Have a good day.

END