

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

Monday 18 May 2015 at 2000 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-ctn-18may15-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

ccNSO

Ron Sherwood, .vi

Annebeth Lange, .no (Co-Chair)

Joke Braeken, .eu

GNSO

Heather Forrest, IPC (Co-Chair)

Colin O'Brien, IPC

Carlos Raul Gutierrez, NPOC

Maxim Alzoba, NTAG

Robin Gross, NCUC

Susan Payne NTAG

At-Large

Cheryl Langdon-Orr

ISO

Jaap Akkerhuis

GAC

Olga Cavalli

Apologies: Jordi Iparraguirre

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings

Bart Boswinkel

Lars Hoffman
Nathalie Peregrine
Ozan Sahin

Coordinator: The recording has started. You may proceed.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Lorenz). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the CWG on Country and Territory Names as TLDs on the 18th of May 2015. On the call today we have Olga Cavalli, Ron Sherwood, Heather Forrest, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maxim Alzoba, Carlos Raul Gutierrez, Joke Braeken, Jaap Akkerhuis, Annebeth Lange, Robin Gross, Colin O'Brien and Susan Payne.

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

Heather Forrest: Thank you very much Nathalie. And Annebeth, good we see that your sound is back on. If you haven't heard the introduction that Nathalie just gave - well perhaps you won't hear me. In any event...

Annebeth Lange: Yes, yes, that's all right.

Heather Forrest: ...you might check your sound.

Annebeth Lange: I've heard it before. It's okay.

Heather Forrest: Good, perfect, Annebeth, perfect. Good morning everyone and good morning, good afternoon, good evening as it were. It's morning here in Australia. Thank you very much for joining our call today for the Cross-Community Working Group for Framework for the Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs.

We have our agenda in the Adobe Room there on the right. We've done our Item Number 1 and we'll move swiftly on to Item Number 2, which is our review of achievements.

And just to introduce this item on the agenda in our last meeting two Mondays ago we met and determined that it would be helpful to have some further revisions to the context, in particular sections of our strawman options paper and bring in the ccTLD perspective in particular and -- if you like -- modernize the information.

The draft that we have in front of us on the screen is prepared in large part by Bart and Annebeth and it was circulated on Saturday. I confess I haven't looked at it as closely as I would like to. I've looked at it but my day job took over yesterday, so I haven't read it line by line.

But what I would like to do is turn to Bart and Bart may ask (unintelligible) for comments along the way to explain the changes that have been made. So Bart if you're willing to do that, over to you please.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes no problem at all. Thank you Heather and good evening all and good day effectively because it's early your morning I know. Let me explain what I've done. That's probably the easiest because this is just my - based on the call I promised Annebeth to assist her in running through it. But at one point I started editing and I thought this might be useful for the whole group to look at.

What I've done effectively is rearrange the introductory - let me scroll through it because the introductory text - so that Section 1 until Section - say until Page, say until Page 8 - I've rearranged it slightly. I've included say a little bit of additional language but what I've done is I've put a lot of the text, detailed text, into the annex at the end of the document.

That's Annex B - thank you - in order to - because it's - how to express it - say the flow of the reasoning was interrupted by the detailed text going into all the details of the - say the Reservation Working Group at the time. So - but the main conclusions etcetera are still included, including the - what ended up in the Applicant Guidebook.

And what you will see right now - and I hope this is visible - yes. The current definitions in the Applicant Guidebook are now in a text (rain). And this is the - what was in the Applicant Guidebook of June 2012. That's the latest version I have seen.

And what's also included in a text (rain) which is different is - and I've asked Jaap to assist me in updating this - is how the ISO 3166/MA is assigning two-letter codes to country and territory names. That's one part of it.

And the second part of it - and that's probably the introductory part of it - is how do countries and territories all - and their subdivisions - end up on the ISO 3166 list? Because I think if you would look at the country and territory definitions in the Applicant Guidebook, they all at the end of the day refer to the ISO 3166 list and that's one list.

So I think once and for all, to at least to bring some clarity around that discussion is it is important that people understand how names of countries - or effectively how countries and territories enter into or get listed and how the MA assigns two lesser codes to these countries and territories.

The reason for this, if you go back -- and this is just a little bit of back-tracking - is if you look at - and it's now called the formative - I've renamed it the formative years - is how the use of names evolved over time and especially how country and territory names or two-letter codes got used in the DNS.

It's just a historical overview and I think that the real turning point is RC 5091 for two reasons. First of all it's still the core policy document for say a

delegation, redelegation of ccTLDs. But also - and that's where this working group probably found more important - it is made very clear and that hasn't changed in that time, since that time - is how the ISO 3166-1 list is viewed at.

And the core is - you can read it yourself - the IANA is not in the business of deciding what is and what not a territory and the ISO 3166 was selected at the time because there was a mechanism, and that mechanism is still there. So therefore the text frame.

So that's the - and then move into the post-RFC 5091 so how country and territory names were used post-RFC 5091. That's what you can read as well. Now in order - and that's part of the discussions of the co-chairs as well. What you can see is the introductory text of the position paper as I've added a little bit of language first of all explaining again what the goal of this working group is because I think the proposed text is - yes, it's all - or say the option paper all derives from the purpose and goal of this Cross-Community Working Group.

So that's what I've included as well and a brief introductory text to effectively Section 1 of the option paper explaining why this overview - at least why in my view - the overview is important to understand the evolution and why the evolution needs to be documented in order to understand the complexities around the use of country and territory names as TLDs. So that's the major changes of the document.

Heather Forrest: Bart thank you very much. It's a tremendous amount of work that's been done. Thanks to you and to Annebeth and to Jaap. I wonder if either Annebeth or - perhaps we'll start with Annebeth. Annebeth, would you like to make any comments on the draft, on where we are now? Annebeth might have dropped off to fix her sound issues. Jaap, would you like to comment on the current status of the draft if you like?

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes. I hope you can hear me now. I like the separation of current working of the ISO 3166 with this because that's - because I got the impression that things are all the time of running into each other. And just making them separate (unintelligible) makes life much easier.

I didn't have time to rewrite the text because I had a conference, but I will do that this week in combination with Bart. But I think to me it looks more clear, but I'm not sure what other people say about it.

Heather Forrest: Thank you Jaap. Would anyone else like to comment on the document?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. Sorry, I was typing and decided it's probably easier for me to talk. Jaap, just double checking, the rewrite you're talking about, the Page 6 text - is that correct?

Heather Forrest: Sorry, Cheryl. Say again?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I was just checking with Jaap...

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes Cheryl, that's the plan.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes the (create out) -- I was looking for the number - yes the (create out) part on Page 6 still contains text which is poor, going into history journeying to what it is now. And that needs to be more reflect what current state is.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The update. Thank you. I just wanted to check that that was correct. That was my assumption, but I just wanted to make sure that was correct. Cheryl for the record again - and while I've got the microphone here I just wanted to say I think these changes are excellent.

I don't actually get to see the markup until it's displayed because the open source software I use doesn't show me the red line even - so the changes aren't seen. So I just sort of let it roar over the weekend and now having exactly what changes are in text popping out at me, you know, I appreciate it even more. But it certainly gets my support. Thanks.

Bart Boswinkel: Cheryl and others, let me be clear. It was - because I shifted so much text around I didn't want to get you color blind or overwhelmed by all the colors and did not send you the real red-line version. Probably what...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Ah. (Unintelligible) if you did.

Bart Boswinkel: And so what I'll do after this call - so tomorrow morning my time - I will send you a comparison document with a clean version of the first of May version that was displayed and this version so you have a sense of what has changed.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. Bart, that's super helpful. Cheryl thank you very much for your comments. I agree. It's an incredible amount of work that's happening between each call. And in the last two weeks Bart has carried the load here.

And Olga I see your question there to know if members of the CCWG can comment on the new revised text. By all means, that's - you're welcome to make a comment now if you'd like to or if you need more time to review, to do that on the list. If you'd like to speak now, Olga, go right ahead.

Olga Cavalli: Hello can you hear me?

Heather Forrest: Yes, yes.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, thank you. This is Olga Cavalli from Argentina from the GAC. Just wanted to know - and congratulations to Bart and to Annebeth and to Jaap for doing a great job. I honestly have no time to review the document in detail.

Would it be possible to have some days to review it and eventually do some comments if it's necessary or not? That's the question. And if it's yes, the answer, how much time we have - how many days we have for doing that. That's my question.

Heather Forrest: Thank you Olga. This is Heather. Our work is always just a work in progress. By all means you can comment at any time. This context or background information has been a work in progress since roughly after Singapore.

And I suppose if referring to Item 3 in the agenda, one of the goals that I have discussed with Carlos and Annebeth in the context of our co-chair call is to perhaps have this in a reasonably solid state, which isn't to say that it can't go back and be tinkered with but to have a reasonably solid state by Buenos Aires.

So there's still plenty of time to make comments on this. It is certainly never suggested that a document comes out and, you know, the next call is the last time to discuss that. So please feel free to make comments when that suits you. And Bart I see your hand. Please go ahead.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes say Olga, if you have comments please do not comment on the text frame on Page 6 where we just discussed because that needs to be updated. We know it needs to be updated. And say the other text part - so because this will be updated.

The other parts will be updated, what needs to be updated if you think so or can be updated if you want to or for further discussion. So it's not just you. It's also other members of the Cross-Community Working Group of course.

Heather Forrest: Thank you Bart. This is Heather. What I would suggest that we do, given that we haven't had that many days to review the text, is perhaps I'll make a pull here for any final comments or questions or concerns about the context or

what we've identified in the agenda as the introduction. And then maybe we move on to two-letter codes.

So would anyone like to make any final comments on the work, the substantive work that's been on the introduction? Don't see any hands. I don't hear any...

Bart Boswinkel: Heather, Carlos's hand is up.

Heather Forrest: Good. Carlos please go ahead. Carlos if you can hear us, go right ahead.

Bart Boswinkel: Carlos you're on mute.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Hello?

Heather Forrest: Yes Carlos, hi.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Hello, can you hear me?

Heather Forrest: Yes.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes so thanks again to Bart for this incredible work and reading the introduction just over the weekend I have the following reaction. We have a wonderful piece of work which is this documentation of what's happening with country and territory names. I don't want to set the objective of the paper as the objective of the working group.

I don't know how to explain this different. I mean it was necessary to document this situation that in the past there was one system for country names and one system for TLDs. And these two systems got merged through the new gTLDs. And I think we should really finish this paper by Buenos Aires but don't expect the objective of the paper to be the objective of the working group.

The paper is wonderful. It sets the whole situation and then we need to go into a discussion what happens now that we got mixed up and two-letter codes and three-letter codes of the ISO aren't enough anymore. And then we need to discuss what's next.

I don't know if I put myself, make myself clear, but we have two different levels -- the paper, which is necessary because it will introduce more people to the issues. And then after rounding it up into a full paper for Buenos Aires then we have to ask ourselves what the working group is going to do next after this great paper.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. Carlos thank you very much. Do I - just to clarify - do I understand your comment to be that this paper let's say documents our work but producing this paper isn't the sole object of our CCWG?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: It was the necessary first step. Otherwise we could not have started. But we should then start thinking what the object is of the working group is beyond this situation paper, beyond this research - right. That's what I wanted to say Heather.

Heather Forrest: Very helpful. And Carlos - again this is Heather - do you have specific comments? You raised them in our co-chairs call about our objective let's say. Is this a good time to ask about that?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yeah I think we should really go thoroughly through the paper and wrap it up with the section on the two-letter codes and the names towards the Buenos Aires meeting. And everybody please keep in the back of your head what has happened and how we are going to come out with some constructive proposals for a broader group after Buenos Aires hopefully.

Heather Forrest: Understood. This is Heather. Thank you Carlos. Annebeth, please go ahead. Annebeth, it's very difficult to hear you. I heard maybe two words, and now it looks like we've lost you I think.

Annebeth Lange: Is this better? Can you hear me now?

Heather Forrest: Yes it is. Perfect, thank you, good.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, very good now.

Annebeth Lange: Okay, I have problems with my (unintelligible) tonight so I'm sorry for that. What I just tried to say is that I agree with Carlos that what these weeks or months we have talked together about this has shown is that the objective we started with and the scope we started with has developed through the work.

And we see other things in our work that we have to perhaps amend or adjust the objective before we go on. And what we have discussed in our co-chair teleconferences is exactly that these are two things. The one thing is what is exactly country and territory names and what do we mean with that?

If the definition from the Applicant Guidebook is still valid or should we have other definition of what's included in country and territory names? And the next question will be to discuss how to treat these country and territory names.

And since the GAC also had taken other wide perspective we have to discuss how should this be blended together or should we have two groups. So it's a lot of confusion out there just now. So we have a lot of work to do with that as well.

Heather Forrest: Thank you Annebeth. This is Heather and I see Cheryl's agreement and Carlos's agreement in the Adobe Room. Indeed, and I think one of the things that we should spend some time on today is indeed talking about Buenos

Aires and how we present our work to that state. Annebeth, can you hear me now?

Annebeth Lange: Yes. Can you hear me?

Heather Forrest: Yes I can hear you. Right we can all say yes at the same time. I think that's our job for Buenos Aires is get ourselves to a point where there is a deliverable, that deliverable being the background story, let's say, and hopefully our work on two-letter codes as well.

That shows the community we've made progress on a difficult issue. It shows the community that we have something to show for our work. And then we move on from there as you and Carlos have suggested. We say look we've achieved this part of our work and what do we do now? Where do we go from here?

One of the things that we've talked about in the context of the co-chairs call is the fact that our charter is very broadly worded. What it is that we do, it was intentionally broadly worded and its use in the term framework suggests that it's really up to us what we come up with in the end, that this wasn't a predetermined outcome, that we decide what the framework means and that we decide how we go forward.

And on the one hand, that I suppose makes me personally a little bit nervous in the sense that we can come up with anything. On the other hand I suppose it's beneficial to have that flexibility so we're not in a position really to talk about framework as such until we really understand what the road map is ahead, what it looks like and having reflected on what we've done in the context of the background information, the introduction and the two-letter codes.

The hope has always been that once we get those things sorted, that that gives us a bit of confidence and a bit of a platform from which to deal with

some more difficult questions. So that I suppose dips our toe into Item 3 in the agenda. Cheryl I see your agreement there. That's helpful.

Let's - if we don't have any further comments on the introductory section and bearing in mind that we do have another meeting before Buenos Aires to discuss that so any comments are very gratefully received between now and the next meeting.

Let's turn our attention perhaps to the two-letter codes. And if I might ask you to scroll. Do we have - Nathalie is scrolling free or am I scrolling for everyone?

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars. The scrolling is free.

Heather Forrest: Thank you Lars. Very helpful. If I can then suggest that you scroll within the Adobe Room to our section on two-letter country codes which start on Page 16 I believe? Yes. We have the formula if you like for the way that this strawman was set out. Like to talk about it.

A few discreet items for each of these categories of representation, the first one being two-letter codes. One we were talking about simply the scope of that discussion. So what is the price (unintelligible) parameter of name or representation of name that's being dealt with in this section, the status quo, meaning what is the current policy within ICANN for the use of this category of names as top level domains?

We have an identification of issues and then we have possible options. And we didn't talk about this section terribly much in our previous, in the call before this one, because we were fairly well focused on the introductory section.

But to recall perhaps that two calls ago I believe I was asked to revisit the options and try and word them a little bit more clearly, a little bit more

cohesively. So now is our time to discuss these two-letter codes. And if anyone has any questions or concerns about the text that's here - bearing in mind we haven't really focused on this text for a few weeks - then I welcome those questions now. Anyone have any questions?

And immediately Bart can I confirm with you - did you - you didn't do terribly much in this section either, did you?

Bart Boswinkel: Nothing, absolutely nothing.

Heather Forrest: So we haven't really tinkered with this text in a few weeks. I asked Bart for the confirmation. With that in mind, does anyone have - ah yes, Cheryl, please go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. Cheryl for the record. Just strikes me that there's some sage-like wisdom here that we need to maybe pop out - for example the note about the misuse of the (Dash 2) list, the terminology there.

Because you've got boxed text earlier on on Page 6 - I was just making a stylistic point - I think we should use similar sorts of formatting tools to pop out to the audience that may very well just be scanning this document as opposed to reading it line by line because some of these, you know, single sentences, are vitally important to help cut through the confusion that we're trying to hopefully have not around at the end of our process.

So I just wanted to say that some things like that second paragraph single sentence note, I'd like to see somehow popped in a way that just stands out of the page and obviously we'll also put it in the abstract. Yes, that's just my immediate reaction there. And it'll happen at other points in the document as well. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. Cheryl thank you for that comment. I think that's extremely helpful. The formatting I think is improving as we go. And Bart has a very

good idea to use these text blocks. And the intention is to even do them in such a way that they are quite eye-catching as you suggest. We have some sort of shading behind them and this sort of thing.

And we'll continue to work on that along the way. And if it does need formatting in a particular meeting then we'll star it and come back to it. So thank you very much.

Anyone else have any comments about what we have here for two-letter country codes? Anyone else have any concerns let's say as to - or perhaps additions to add? Annebeth, yes please.

Annebeth Lange: Everyone that's following the discussion and sitting in the group from this stakeholder group could go through this potential option that will try to make - to get some ideas from the different stakeholder groups, what they think should be the good things about the different options we have (out). So it's much easier if we get something in this box to discuss it.

And it might be different views from different perspectives. And we have different experience. So if it be possible for the group to give this some thought until next time and put some text in, that would be helpful so we are not doing all this by ourselves if the stakeholder groups, they are working together with.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. Annebeth I think it's a fantastic idea, absolutely fantastic. It's very hard to draft on the fly. We've said that on other calls. And indeed these areas, the word choice is important. The experience is important. We have two chartering organizations within this Cross-Community Working Group and indeed other groups within ICANN that have joined us.

And I think that's a very helpful way to progress things is to go back to our organizations and ask for input here. Perhaps that's something that we set for a goal for the next call is that each group comes forward with suggestions the GNSO, the ccNSO, in particular where - let's say particularly responsible for the Cross-Community Working Group, its chartering organizations.

But any other group that might like to make some comments and additions to this space, that will only make the document more robust. To the extent that we have differences about benefits and burdens then we can identify those here. Perhaps the box, perhaps the text box is too simple for whatever we come up with as text.

But I think Annebeth it's a fantastic suggestion. Does anyone have any concerns or comments about Annebeth's suggestion? Don't see any.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry Cheryl here. I'm typing again and didn't raise my hand - half typing anyway. I was just wondering to make that piece of work which I think is an important and very useful piece of work, Annebeth, easier is it possible for staff to extract that table which runs over two pages on the current document so that we can take that to - as an excerpt and have the input worked on and then get all of those bits and pieces back to be aggregated before the next call?

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. Cheryl thank you. That's very helpful. And Lars thank you for your comment. Carlos we've got some stylistic comments here about how that could best be done. I think that's very helpful.

It's true. Sitting on Page 16 or 18 or wherever it is isn't ideal let's say for turning around answers on this particular point. So I think that's very helpful approach. So we'll note that. Annebeth, please go ahead. Or is that perhaps an old hand?

Annebeth Lange: I wrote it actually. I wondered if we get into it from the different stakeholders and interested party if they can manage to give it some thought and send it into Lars. When do you need it Lars to be able to make a paper where we can see the different options coming in for discussion? That would make it much easier when we talk together in two weeks.

Lars Hoffman: Annebeth very quickly, so the next call would be Monday the 1st of June. So if you want to give me time to review it, I think Wednesday 27th would be a good deadline. And then I would have it out for sure by Friday at the latest.

Annebeth Lange: Mm-hm.

Lars Hoffman: So Friday, 22nd of May would be a deadline.

Annebeth Lange: Could I ask if it's the same time on the 1st? Or is that the morning call?

Lars Hoffman: It's yet to be determined. Normally we said that we alternate between calls in - the next will be a morning call again but (unintelligible).

Annebeth Lange: Yes.

Heather Forrest: Lars thank you. This is Heather. I think that is helpful. I think we acknowledge that so it's by next Wednesday if we can - I think that's helpful. We aim for next Wednesday. We acknowledge the fact that we bump up against the work that's happening around IANA transition and very busy time tables and very busy schedules and this sort of thing.

I think what we do is we aim for next Wednesday. We see how we go. Let's say we're trying and push quite hard. Helpful that we have a - yes, exactly. We have a GNSO council meeting this week. So Carlos and I can expedite that. But that said, the Council meeting isn't until Thursday. So we'll see how we go.

We shall do our best and again I suppose aim for having this in a reasonable state by Buenos Aires if we can. I think it's an excellent suggestion.

With that perhaps - unless there are other comments on this - I think it's probably sensible to turn to Item 3 in the agenda which is exactly that, to talk

in concrete terms about our planning for the next ICANN meeting. Anyone have any concerns before we move on?

I hear no concerns, see no one's hands raised. With that in mind then we have - and Lars help me - we said we have two meetings before BA. Is that correct?

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars. Well we have the next meeting on the 1st of May - of June I'm sorry. It's in a fortnight. And then the two weeks after will be the 15th, which is the pre-ICANN meeting, which normally is when people travel although it's obviously a Monday.

So we could either try then or we could also just have as an exception, a meeting on the 1st and then the 8th just any leftover items before BA.

Heather Forrest: That's helpful. Thank your Lars. This is Heather. And that's true. Let's not get tied up in that week before because people are traveling and that sort of thing. So my suggestion then would be that in terms of this document we'll make a 3.0 if you like in the agenda.

In terms of this - and indeed Carlos you're right about timing - in terms of this document what I would suggest we do is this. If you have comments to make on the context please we have the text in front of us. Please try as best you can to make those between now and the next meeting on the first of June.

Again, not to say that that would be set in stone, but it would be helpful for the purposes of the next meeting and making progress to have those comments between then and now.

We'll extract this table and send this around and we'll aim to have comments on this by the 27th, so in advance of our next meeting. What I anticipate is then that those comments - any comments received would be circulated immediately prior or a few days prior to our next meeting, which will put us in

roughly the same position we're in now where we're looking at a draft that many of us haven't had as wholesome a chance to review as we like.

We'll do what we can in the next meeting. We'll acknowledge the changes that have been made. If any contributions - if anyone has any questions around any of the contributions we'll ask those in that meeting. And I think then we move forward into the ICANN face-to-face meeting prepared to perhaps not decide but to make some - oh I suppose comments - in a more hearty way affirming or denying the options and the work that we've done.

Forgive me. My brain is struggling. I did a poor job of articulating that. In any event I think what we need to do is get to Buenos Aires and be in a position where we have a text that we can say, "Yes, I agree with that." "No I don't agree with that," and move forward and perhaps start -- to the extent that we have that disagreement -- carving out where agreement lies and where there are points of difference and this sort of thing.

And then that along with Item 3.1 - I do Cheryl. I do. It's early in the morning here. I see this conversation about what time zone and I'm getting grumpy.

The - let's talk about our next meeting. Annebeth I see your comment so let's actually add that to any other business rather than have this a stream of chat at the moment.

Progress report - so my comment is this. We'll add this potential options table. We'll circulate that around. We get the feedback, and that along with the work that we achieved, we'll plug that back in before Buenos Aires and we'll have a draft then of this options paper that largely is the front end, that is the context and that is two-letter codes.

We'll take that and then work together a progress report. You may remember that back the end of last year we put together with staff's help - Bart in

particular - put together a progress report to update the community at large as to where we were in our work.

So I think we'd aim for that after our meeting in Buenos Aires, assuming we get done what we need to do between then and now. And that really updates the community coming out of our face-to-face meeting. I think we do quite well in getting things done in face-to-face meetings where we are.

Susan asked do we know when our meeting would be in Buenos Aires. Lars can you help me out in that one please? It's a Monday.

Lars Hoffman: Sorry Heather. I just had to unmute here. Yes indeed. Your memory serves right. It's Monday the 22nd. And that is from 1:00 to 2:30. It's an hour and a half but you know all the timings are, you know, still with a pinch of salt. Nothing is confirmed yet but this is what we asked for and what we've promised - been promised in fact.

Heather Forrest: Thank you very much Lars. This is Heather. That keeps us out of Constituency (now) which is difficult. We've had a bit of challenge in trying to fit in our working group now that there's let's say more interest in what we're doing -- fit it into a time where there isn't 16 other things on and other responsibilities.

So that's - as soon as we have firmed up our time for Buenos Aires (unintelligible) we will circulate that on the list.

Anyone have any concerns then about my poorly articulated goals for Buenos Aires being let's finish, let's do what Annebeth very rightly suggests. Let's pull out this table on potential options. Let's finish up the comments the best that we can on the introduction. Let's go to Buenos Aires. Let's talk about those things and say, "Thumbs up, thumbs down," and let's put together a progress report to update the community on where we are at that point.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here very briefly, thanks. Just with the timings on meetings and things in Buenos Aires, as usual with the middle year meeting that is the most intense time for the Nominating Committee. And if it clashes with one of my Non-Comm appointments issues obviously I'll tender my apologies.

But if Lars gets the date out to us as early as possible, as soon as it's turned up, then -- as the calendar invite or whatever -- then I can try. The June meeting is always the worst to try and get any of the others and quadruple bookings. So my standing apology for the June meeting I suspect. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. Cheryl thank you very much and that you managed to fit us in at all and you're always a regular on the call. That's very much appreciated. So we'll gladly have you when we can have you and if not we'll miss your absence but look forward to your comments along the way.

With that Item 3.2, which is interaction with the GAC Working Group, one of the points that came out of Singapore was -- from across the community -- was how can our group and the GAC Working Group better work together. Perhaps Olga this is an opportune time to turn to you and ask you for your thoughts on that. How can your group and our group work better together please?

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Heather. This is Olga Cavalli for the record again. Well what I did for the moment is to share some minutes that (Tom Dale) helped me prepare after the last conference call that I participated with you. And we will have a conference call next week from our working group.

So my idea is to keep the working group updated of this document and other outcomes that this Cross-Community Working Group is doing. This is one side about coordination.

Then we - as I told you in the previous conference call - we are focusing now more in trying to define some more general concerns about the use of

geographic and community names, which is how to define the community interest, what is public interest, and also introducing a document that has two visions - the one that is towards the interest of the communities and towards the interest of the legal concerns.

So this is more or less where we are now. Also I would like to ask you in the - in all the work that this Cross-Community Working Group has been doing - have you reviewed the limitations or regulations that exist for the use of country and territory names at the national level? Because we would like to also explore that side of the national regulations and have perhaps - group them into document or something.

This is more or less - more for the future, not for Buenos Aires. But perhaps you have some information in this regulation. So this is more or less what we plan to do from now until Buenos Aires. And what I would like to do with the document is to revise it in detail and send a revised version with some marks to our working group and see if we can comment more than myself as a group and do some contributions if they are necessary to enhance the document.

Heather Forrest: Olga thank you. I see we have a number of hands, so Carlos and then Robin please.

Bart Boswinkel: Carlos we can't hear you.

Olga Cavalli: I cannot hear Carlos.

Heather Forrest: Carlos we're having trouble perhaps with your mute. I'll tell you what we'll do. Carlos, we'll sort you out in the background. Robin please go ahead and then Lars.

Robin Gross: Hi this is Robin. Can you hear me okay?

Heather Forrest: Yes, can do, Robin. Thank you very much.

Robin Gross: Great, thank you. Yes I just had a couple of questions for Olga. My stakeholder group is very interested in what they're working on in the GAC Working Group. And I understand it's looking like a database may be coming up there.

And so one of my questions is I'm wondering what is - is there any type of criteria that one would need to supply in order to get particular word into that database? How is that going to work?

Olga Cavalli: I'm sorry. What database are you talking about? I don't know.

Robin Gross: Okay so I think it was the last call of this working group. I think it was you that was talking about with a database of geographic names. Am I wrong about that? Is there no database in the works?

Olga Cavalli: Well we have talked several different things in different versions of background documents. But at the moment we don't have that idea in the draft document because we came to the conclusion that it's extremely complex to build such a database or such a list.

It's something that we talked about before but honestly after talking among - even among countries - even from the governmental perspective it's extremely complex.

So we don't have that idea any more. It could be good as a reference but it's extremely complex to maintain and to build. So maybe this is - to answer your question...

Robin Gross: Yes, no that's very helpful because I was under the impression that we would be seeing a database coming out of that working group of geographic terms. And so if that's not what's happening that's very helpful to know.

Olga Cavalli: Robin if I may, if I remember well, you and your stakeholder group did comment on our last version of the document and there was no reference of a database in that document.

Robin Gross: Yes I had heard it was very recent, so it would be sequent to that. It sounds like you're saying that that's not the direction the working group is heading in now.

Olga Cavalli: Maybe I have expressed myself in my poor English wrongly, but that's not the idea for the moment.

Robin Gross: Okay, great.

Olga Cavalli: Maybe the future but not at the moment.

Robin Gross: Okay thank you. That answers my question then. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Okay back to you.

Heather Forrest: Robin and Olga thank you very much. Lars and then Susan please.

Lars Hoffman: Thank you Heather. This is Lars for the record. Olga thank you very much for that. It was very helpful. I was just wondering whether you're working - you mentioned two times community names and geographic names.

I was just wondering whether in your group you're working on the definition or criteria for those two terms because that would be something that would be very helpful for our work here. And it's something that we might be able to share and would certainly be very useful if there's something sometimes that we could all agree on. And I'm just wondering where you are with that and how you foresee that working out. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you for the question. It's a very good question. What we realized is that there is a lack of definition or at least there are different views of public interest. And that came up after all the comments that we received to our background document.

So this is something that we have - we want to explore with the public interest needs and also we want to explore the community interest - yes the community, the meaning of geographic and other names for the communities. Yes, we will start now working on that.

We are gathering all the information that is around ICANN documents about public interest and we want to draft a new part of our background document. And yes we want to explore this more community-based ideas and background.

And I do agree with you that it could be a good complement. Complement is not the right English word. This is my bad English. How do you say when something adds...

Lars Hoffman: Complementary.

Olga Cavalli: ...value to - complementary to the work of this Cross-Community Working Group. Yes I agree with you and I'll keep you updated about any news and any draft document that we prepare.

Heather Forrest: Olga thank you. Lars I'm not sure that that - as I understood your question - that that answered your question. Do you agree?

Lars Hoffman: Well I think it answered partially. I think what I gather is that Olga you don't have a definition yet on what exactly you mean by that but it's something you're working on. Is that what you said?

Olga Cavalli: Sorry I didn't hear you very well. I'm sorry.

Lars Hoffman: No problem. I'll go again. Just to paraphrase I think what I gathered from your answer is that your group as of yet has no definition for these terms yet but it's something you're working on.

Olga Cavalli: Yes exactly.

Lars Hoffman: Is that right? Okay.

Olga Cavalli: And I'll keep the whole Cross-Community Working Group updated. Once we work a little bit further how are we moving towards where...

Lars Hoffman: Right. And are you starting a discussion also from the Applicant Guidebook? Do you have a basis yet from where you start the front pages (unintelligible)?

Olga Cavalli: Well that's an interesting comment. We have no - we have discussed this a lot among us. We have no idea how a new Applicant Guidebook will look like. And also in the beginning we've started by drafting new text. But honestly we found that may not have any value. It should be the time when a new draft Applicant Guidebook for Round 2 comes to the light, the time for commenting.

So this is why we want to work on all this definitions and different ideas. So I wouldn't say specifically talking about text for the Applicant Guidebook but yes, having in mind some definitions and some background when the time comes to do some comments and contributions to this new round Applicant Guidebook, if it's the name that it'll have.

Lars Hoffman: Thank you Olga.

Heather Forrest: Thank you Olga. Thank you Lars. This is Heather. Carlos do we have you back? Your hand is up. I see your...

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes, yes, can you hear me? Can you hear me?

Olga Cavalli: Yes but before you it's Susan I see in the...

Heather Forrest: I think - I'm trying to come to back to Carlos's sound some time ago.

Olga Cavalli: Oh sorry. Yes you're right. So sorry.

Heather Forrest: And then I promise I won't forget Susan. No Carlos we lost you. If it's - yes please go ahead Carlos.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Can you hear me now?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Heather Forrest: Yes.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Hello, can you hear me?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Heather Forrest: Yes.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Olga I think your comments and Lars's comments are very important.

Before the Applicants Guidebook we had no definition. We had just a list and then the applicants - a list of country names - only country names. Then the Applicants Guidebook jumped by ten miles and went all the way down to geography and geopolitics.

So I beg you -- when you go back to your GAC Working Group - I beg you to take a look at our middle ground definition. We're proposing in this paper an external definition. And please take the time to look at this definition and ask

your colleagues if this definition covers their national considerations or not - at least in terms of their country names -- not all the other names.

I think this is very important for us. This is very important for our paper that you take a look at this (unintelligible) definition and discuss it for the country names because right now we have new delegations and new scripts. We got last week - (unintelligible) delegated with the two-letter code in Greek alphabet, which is not on that list, you know.

So we have to set some rules and boundaries here so please take a close look at our first definition in the definition list from your point of view and give us feedback please. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Okay we will. Thank you for letting us know.

Heather Forrest: Thank you Carlos. This is Heather. And picking up on Annebeth's comment in the chat, I think the intention is just to canvass some perspectives here on the definition rather than suggest that that's a definition that the group has agreed. It's certainly a work in progress. I've made the comment in our co-chairs call that that really is likely our next step in my view is talking about that definition.

I'm conscious of our time. I'm conscious of the fact that Susan has had her virtual hand up for quite a while. Susan please go ahead and then I'll say a final word and we'll end our call. Thank you.

Susan Payne: Thank you. It was really just a very quick one. I just wanted to say thank you very much to Olga for her update. And apologies if I missed it but I wondered if you could let us know what the status is of your paper in terms of are you expecting to have a further draft in time for Buenos Aires? Or do you feel that this is something that there is more work to be done on and that there perhaps won't be a further draft for some time? Or indeed are you going down a different path now?

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Susan. We will update the document adding all the summary of the legal concerns that we're receiving, different comments in our comment period. So the document we have - as I said before and I said in the previous call - sort of like the two visions, the one from the community and the one from the legal concerns and other stakeholder concerns.

That's the idea of the new document. It is not changing the previous part mainly but it's adding other views.

Susan Payne: Thank you. I'm sorry again just -- because maybe I've missed it -- but is that something that you're expecting to have done by Buenos Aires or will it be subsequent to that?

Olga Cavalli: We hope to finish and present it during Buenos Aires meeting and you're welcome to join us.

Susan Payne: Thank you so much.

Olga Cavalli: You're welcome.

Heather Forrest: Susan this is Heather. Susan thank you. That was a very helpful clarification. Olga thank you for your answer. Carlos I suspect you have an old hand. In light of the time, any other business? We said we wanted to talk about the timing of the next meeting.

What I suggest we do is we do that on the list in light of the fact that it's 7:03 here my time - three minutes over - I would also like to pick up on a point. I'm not convinced that we've really dealt with this question of our interaction with the GAC Working Group. It seems to me that we would like to move beyond simply the GAC Working Group being kept up to date of our work.

I think there's a question to be asked in Buenos Aires, perhaps when we're all face to face - which is how do we work - how do we achieve that interaction - not simply updates but how do we achieve that interaction? With that we'll talk about the timing of our next call.

Olga Cavalli: Can I comment Heather?

Heather Forrest: Yes, yes, go ahead.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. And I agree with you that it shouldn't be only updating. I have tried, and I sent several e-mails to our working group and the whole GAC and see if other colleagues can join me on the calls and help me with the comments and also revising the document.

For the moment - and I don't think this is - not having interest in this issue particularly - but it's a busy time for all of us and a lot of documents to review about the IANA transition and other things. So I would write this point again during Buenos Aires and our conference call. So maybe other colleagues can join us so we have more interaction.

Heather Forrest: That's helpful Olga. Thank you very much. With that Carlos just to confirm - we are out of time - but is that an old hand? Checking. There we go. Yes, marvelous. Good.

Well thank you very much everyone for joining us today. Thank you for your input. To summarize we're going to have the options table on two-letter codes and we're going to have comments on the introduction and we'll make those to the best of our knowledge before - or the best of our ability -- before the next meeting and discuss them at the next meeting with a view to some sort of finalization in Buenos Aires. Thank you everyone for joining us.

Olga Cavalli: Bye-bye.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Lars Hoffman: Thanks Heather. Bye-bye.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go and boil the kettle, Heather. Go on.

Heather Forrest: Exactly. Cheers. Have a good day Cheryl.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much for this (Lorenz). You may now stop the recordings.

END