

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

**Monday, 11 January 2016 at 21:00 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-11jan16-en.mp3>

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

### Attendees:

#### ccNSO:

Annebeth Lange, .no  
Grigori Saghyan, .am  
Mirjana Tasic, .rs  
Ron Sherwood, .vi  
Laura Hutchinson, .uk  
Mart Uduma, .ng  
Paul Szyndler, .au (co-Chair)  
Sanna Sahlman, .fi

#### GNSO

Heather Forrest, IPC (co-Chair)  
Carlos Raul Gutierrez, NPOC (co-Chair)  
Colin O'Brien, IPC  
Susan Payne, NTAG  
Griffin Barnett, IPC  
Maxim Alzoba, NTAG  
Robin Gross, NCSG

#### At-Large:

None

#### Other:

Jaap Akkerhuis  
Nigel Cassimire  
Panagiotis Papaspiliopoulos

Apologies:  
Cheryl Landon-Orr

ICANN staff:  
Bart Boswinkel  
Lars Hoffmann  
Patrick Jones  
Michelle DeSmyter

Michelle DeSmyter: ...Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the CWG-CTN meeting on the 11th of January at 2100 UTC. On the call today we have Carlos Raul Gutierrez, Heather Forrest, Jaap Akkerhuis, Annebeth Lange, Ron Sherwood, Mary Uduma, Maxim Alzoba, Mirjana Tasic, Susan Payne, Nigel Cassimire, Griffin Barnett, Paul Szyndler, Sanna Sahlman, Robin Gross, Colin O'Brien. We have apologies from Cheryl Landon-Orr. And from staff we have Bart Boswinkel, Patrick Jones, Lars Hoffmann and myself, Michelle DeSmyter.

I would like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you and over to you Heather.

Heather Forrest: Excellent. Thanks very much, (Michelle). And thanks very much for your support of the meeting. This is our first meeting of the Cross Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs in 2016. And indeed my first meeting back after a few weeks away so thank you very much for your patience while I was tending to a family thing.

We have before us today, as Lars noted in his meeting - or in his email that went around at the end of last week, a bit of a summary of where we are on the community feedback that we've received to our survey on three-character TLDs. As you may recall, we sent around a survey in I believe it was late August, early September asking the community for input. This is not a formal public comment process, it needs to be said, but an informal, if you like, information gathering exercise; one that we've used in the past in this cross

community working group and indeed a mechanism that we used in the study group that predated this cross community working group.

And we, at the point of the Dublin meeting back in October, we had received quite a few comments but not (unintelligible) I should say responses rather than comments - we'd received quite a few responses but we knew that there were others coming in the buildup to Dublin; we knew that there were a number of communities that needed more time. And indeed following Dublin and during the week in Dublin we received several more - several more pieces of feedback, several more responses.

And as Lars noted in his email last week it was really very important in preparation for this meeting, and I hope you took his words to heart, that you had a look at what has been prepared, which is essentially a summary - very helpful summary put together by staff that collates, simply put, into a single document all of the comments that were received during that - or responses that were received during that process.

It's important to say, and I'll turn to Lars in a second, but from a co-chair's point of view, from a member point of view, it's important to note that the responses that you see in the summary document have not been altered or amended in any way; they are simply a cut and paste of the responses that were received.

So with that as an introduction, may I perhaps turn to Lars just to offer a little bit more explanation as to this document and the mechanics of it and then we'll go through our Item Number 2. Thank you.

Lars Hoffmann: Thank you, Heather. This is Lars for the record. Yes, as Heather, she pointed out very kindly this is a document that we put together from the staff side based on the feedback that was received. And it is to note that there is also another document that was circulated that it contains the exact wording of all

the submissions. I can pull that up if you want in the AC room but it should be in your inbox, which has been sent today and (unintelligible).

And it's (unintelligible) couple of submissions that are not part of that yet although they have been submitted from Nominet and there's a couple others that are forthcoming so by the next time we meet we should have an updated and completed document. Having said that, I think the substance of what you will see in front of you, especially in this condensed summary, will not change greatly.

I'm just going to sync everybody for one second so I can take you through the document and be also the same screen. So there's a couple of overview general observations and some suggested to-dos for the members of this working group. And then I tried to summarize a couple of the key arguments that are brought forward. And then here you see from Page 3 onward it's a visual overview pie chart of response (unintelligible) of who supported and who didn't support various questions.

It's worth noting that, you know, the responses are not necessarily that each respondent had said yes to one option and no to all the others. So the - this should be borne in mind when you access these pie charts. And one interesting outcome of this was that although there were clear submissions from the GNSO due to the structure mainly, I presume of the GNSO, they were all rather unanimous, and you see later in the charts you can see (unintelligible). And whereas the ccNSO which had in terms of numbers, by far the most submissions, it's less cohesive.

There's a majority view surely on the ccNSO side but it's not (unintelligible) review point that was (detectable) anyway from the GNSO submissions. So there is something that maybe should be borne in mind as we move forward.

And in addition there is something that came out of the comments and I think that I would like to (unintelligible) to the group to consider is that

(unintelligible) is that the - some of the arguments or the points that I put forward seemed to me to be more a justification of the desired outcome. So submitted that while this is what we would like to see and then here are a couple of reasons why we think that would be a good idea.

And I think the group would be advised to, if it's all possible, start the other way around and see where are some principles that we can all agree on upon which policy should be based deriving from what exists at the moment, deriving what the group has agreed on (unintelligible) and any other general principles that the group can come up with. And from that then kind of reflect upon what the actual policy should be.

I think that would be very helpful and also would help overcoming or maybe creating a more broad consensus than it may be apparent right now from the board base that (unintelligible).

And, Heather, I think I'll leave it at that and pass it back to you unless there are any other questions. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: That's very helpful, Lars. And thank you very much for your hard work here. We can all see that this is a - quite a lengthy document. And, again, I think can't overall or underemphasize this point that no changes have been made in terms of replicating the comments that have been submitted. But there's a fair bit of work that's been done by you and your team in terms of putting this into a form that we can all understand in a single document and in a form we can understand and the analysis of a pie chart that is indeed very helpful.

I think now what would be appropriate is to take up our Item Number 2 more formally, which is the tour de table to the extent that having reviewed this document anyone has questions or comments or concerns. I'll kick off that discussion by saying from my perspective I think one of the things that's very helpful about the pie chart that addition to this document, is it shows that we have - we have received a very broad range of inputs here, a very broad

range of responses. And that we don't have unanimity in terms of a community perspective, let's say.

And from my part, that's entirely anticipated. I think we knew going into this exercise that we would not have - we would not have full agreement on any particular point. I'll pick up on Lars's comment and say as a representative from the GNSO that it is the case that the way the GNSO often works is it speaks on behalf of well let's say within the GNSO a constituency or stakeholder group will submit a comment and that could represent thousands of people; it might represent hundreds of people; it might represent a smaller number of respondents.

Certainly speaking from my own community within the IPC there was an IPC comment that was submitted and that represents the work of - I don't know what our membership is now but it's several hundred at least. So that then suggests to you that we shouldn't be viewing the number of responses as indicative, let's say, of any particular thing but rather that we have a good broad range of views.

And with that I will turn it over. Lars, I see your hand up, is that an old hand or a new hand?

Lars Hoffmann: Thank you, Heather. This is Lars. It's a new hand. Just a quick note in addition to what I've said earlier, when you go through these comments and as you review them just something to bear in mind that this is not - this wasn't a public comment forum, as such. So the groups have outlined that the comments reviewed, although they're valuable and people who submitted them have spent time on this and it's clearly their viewpoints that they're trying to make clear to the group - we - I'm just going to wait for this to stop.

Michelle DeSmyter: One moment.

Lars Hoffmann: No problem.

Michelle Desmyter: One moment please. One moment, the operator is finding the line.

Lars Hoffmann: Thanks. That's great. Thank you, Michelle. Yeah so just to remind everyone that the way (unintelligible) is not necessarily the same that would be the case if it had been an official public comment, you know, procedure that's taken place. So we were testing the water, if you want, and wants to get general feedback from the community as a starting point for our discussion.

And at this point I think we should be less - or the group should feel less bound or guided by the comments than would be the case if it had been a public comment forum on a concrete proposal. And I'm just going to leave it out there for everybody. Thank you.

This is Lars again. I'm not sure whether Heather is still on the call. It might have been her who got dropped. I think it would be great to hear back from the members of this group who are on the call at the moment what they think if they read the document what they think of - think (unintelligible) this and general observations and see what their viewpoint is in terms of how to move forward.

There's obviously several options and we could do it in a way what we did for the two-letter codes whereby we produced a concrete wording that would then be, you know, informs a straw man that would then we put out for discussion for the group. We could also see what kind of general principles have come out of the responses and what - what issues the group can come up with independent of the responses that were submitted and see if we can derive to some recommendations from there.

So, yes, let us know what you think, how to proceed and that you thought about the comments submitted (unintelligible). Thanks. And I just got a ping from Heather that she got dropped off the call but she will be dialed in very

shortly so I'm just going to take a couple minutes. Annebeth, you raised your hand, if you want to speak the floor is yours.

Annebeth Lange: Yes hello. This is Annebeth Lange. I think it's very important that the members of the group really go through this summary that the secretariat has made. It's (unintelligible) it gives a kind of feeling of what the meanings are around the different communities. But it is important that (unintelligible) as the co-chairs, even if we are for, we are not the ones to form the principles and the policies. We (unintelligible) to come with your input and if we can't (unintelligible) makes the work very difficult. Thank you.

Lars Hoffmann: Annebeth, I'm so sorry, can I just interrupt you? I don't know about the others. The sound quality was very bad at my end. Could you possibly...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Annebeth? Annebeth, your phone is a bit too loud. So if you can tone it down a little bit?

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: Okay, I'll try.

Bart Boswinkel: A little bit more. No is...

Annebeth Lange: Is that better now? Better?

Bart Boswinkel: No it's not. If you can increase the distance between the microphone and your mouth a little bit, maybe that helps.

Annebeth Lange: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, that's better.



Annebeth Lange: Is this better?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, it is. So if you could repeat again what...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah?

Annebeth Lange: Is that better now?

Bart Boswinkel: No, it's just as bad. When you had...

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: I'm sorry. (Unintelligible) but it's I'm not sure what to do to get it better.

Bart Boswinkel: If you increase the distance between your microphone and when you speak and your mouth that will help.

Annebeth Lange: Okay, is that better?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, it is.

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

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. Yeah.

Annebeth Lange: Yeah, okay, we try again. So what I was trying to say is that there are other cultures is that we are trying to be (unintelligible) working group has to give their view. But the problem is that it's not (unintelligible) what the secretariat really has worked hard to get out the (unintelligible) to give us your thoughts. Did you hear me now?

Lars Hoffmann: This is Lars, Annebeth, for the record. I don't know if you can hear me.

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: Can you hear me now?

Lars Hoffmann: Let's say it wasn't...

((Crosstalk))

Lars Hoffmann: ...the clearest you've ever had on the record but I think we could make it out more or less.

Annebeth Lange: Okay. I'll try to write.

Lars Hoffmann: Thank you. Anybody else on the call who'd like to voice an opinion or a preference on the topic?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: If I may, Lars? Carlos. I only have a phone line.

Lars Hoffmann: Of course, Carlos. Please go ahead.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes, I would like to add to Annebeth that we are very interested in putting forward this straw man document for the large meeting we're planning to have in Marrakesh. We have a few more calls but not many. And ideally we would expect the feedback to come fast so we can go through it over the next month and hopefully keep the momentum that we had from the last meeting that was very well visited in Dublin and come to Marrakesh with this straw man as proposed so by then we should have covered two-letter codes and three-letter codes and show that the group is making progress. Thank you very much.

Lars Hoffmann: Thank you, Carlos. Laura, you had your hand up and then Heather. Laura, if you're speaking you might be on mute. We can't hear you. Laura's hand has gone down. Heather, did you want to take over? No. Silence all around. I hope that has to do with - not to do with my line. Okay, well if there's no further comments, nobody has any particular thought on how to proceed, I think - I mean, the staff sentiment on this if I can be so bold to share it with you is that, I mean, it might be the most effective way might be that we would actually...

Heather Forrest: Bart, it's Heather.

Lars Hoffmann: Heather, go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Apologies. I'm back. No, that's fine. I felt like I'd abandoned you and I was just sitting here in silence waiting for the ring-back.

Lars Hoffmann: That's okay, no worries. Heather if I can just finish the point. I mean, what I was just going to say is that from, you know, (unintelligible) for the first part when we had the straw man - we discussed concrete proposals if you want. I just want to reiterate that that might be an option to move forward but obviously it's not for us to determine how to proceed. Heather, over to you, I'll remain quiet for now.

Heather Forrest: No, Lars, please it's not about remaining quiet. Thank you for filling the - thanks for filling the gap. Thanks very much. So just a quick comment. In relation to Carlos's suggestion, that's when I originally raised my hand and realized I couldn't speak. The - I think the challenge in front of us is really what Lars noted at the outset which is that we have - we have in some of the responses, let's say, almost a cart before the horse.

The way that we had attacked two-letter codes was to say what policy can - what rationale, what policy rationale can drive our outcome. And here we've had an outcome that's sort of driving the policy rationale or at least

suggestions of that. And I think to the extent that we can we want to be very, very careful because we are going to have to defend our recommendations to the broader community and particularly in this instance given that we have a fair bit of dissonance across the responses, we don't have a uniform response, a uniform position.

I think we need to be very careful to say what policy can drive the outcome that we might achieve. And in terms of word-smithing and how we articulate this, the only amendment that I might suggestion that we make to the document that we have in front of us on the screen, the summary document, and albeit it's a very picky point, but I think it's helpful, is we start off by saying under the heading Introductory Comments, the remit of the CWGUCTN is to develop a policy framework.

As our charter is specifically worded our first goal is to see if it's possible to come to an agreement on a policy framework. And that's where we are now. I think we haven't really experienced that with two-letter codes. But we are experiencing it here with three-letter codes. So I think one of the possible options is that we go back to the community and we say thank you very much for all of your input. Based on that input we received a broad range of responses.

Here is what we understand those responses to equate to that we have a diversity of views and that there are certain points at which that diversity can't necessarily be boiled down to a single position. So if it is possible to find common ground, just picking up on Annebeth's comment in the chat, if it is possible to find common ground then we can articulate that but I wouldn't like to think that we as a group have some tremendous stress that we can't progress because we say we can't come to common ground because indeed that is in many ways equally helpful to the process that this would become a part of.

We're not here to make policy ourselves; we're here as a cross community working group to establish a community position to the extent that that's possible and that would then get folded into a broader policy development process undertaken by the GNSO in the same way that the previous round policy development occurred.

So with that in mind I think - I would encourage us all to have a look at this summary document. Number one, make sure that your comment, if you or your group has submitted a comment, make sure that your comment has been appropriately, accurately expressed in the document; that there's nothing, for example, there's not a paragraph that's been left off or something like this.

Have a look at the views of other - of other groups what's been submitted. And perhaps come to a view, you as an individual member of this cross community working group, can we reach a harmonized point? I think that's a very helpful next step. Bart, I see your hand, over to you, please.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, just to be very precise on, say, the charter and the remit of the CTN, it is to provide advice regarding the feasibility of developing a consistent and uniform definitional framework, so not even a policy framework a definition of framework that could be applicable of respectable SOs and ACs. So, it's more around, and that is, say going back to the time when the charter was drafted. And, this is from recommendations of the study group. The study group, at the time, was very aware that policy might be already a bit too far because that's SO specific, so GNSO and ccNSO specific, and this is the step before going into policy.

Heather Dryden: That's certainly helpful Bart, certainly helpful indeed. That's exactly what we need to bear in mind, and I think it's important that we do that because I don't want our group, as long as we've been at our work, and we still have more work to go, I don't want us to become discouraged or disheartened or despondent in the fact that we think that there's failure.

In fact, I agree with Carlos's comment in the chat. We're happy about the number of variety of opinions. It's a healthy result. Of course, it's not an easy starting point for common recommendations, but a common recommendation on a given point may be that we have this. We can all agree with we have this diversity of views and it's not worthy to at this point to come to a unified position. However, we've done a significant amount of hard work in collating the views and putting them all together in one place, so I think that's a very, very important step. Bart, your hand is up, old hand or a new hand?

Man: An old hand.

Heather Dryden: Would anyone else like to comment? Is it acceptable to the group that we use that approach that I outlined going forward, that you go back and look at the document to the extent that you haven't already done so, and ensure that your own comment, or the comment of your group or community is accurately presented.

I don't anticipate that you'll find any discrepancies, but I think it's a good opportunity to do that given that you have taken the time-specific comment, make sure that we've captured them, and then come to perhaps a finger-on-the-pulse view as to whether you think for the various points that agreement is possible, and then don't simply rely on the pie chart for the substance of the comment. Is that a way forward? Silence is golden, which means yes. Everyone agrees wholeheartedly. Brilliant.

Paul Szyndler: Heather, it's Paul if I may?

Heather Dryden: Please Paul go right ahead.

Paul Szyndler: Apologies again I'm also only on audio at the moment. I've been holding my tongue throughout the call because I did want to hear what others had to say because I've got particular views as to how we can move forward from here,

both procedurally and how we handle the responses that we've gotten. But I didn't want to verbalize that too much given that I had a fairly leading hand in terms of how the study group attacked it, so I was going to see if there were any different points of view.

I just want to back up what you said in terms of this going back to the community need to clarify that their inputs have been accurately captured. I think that's a very good step. It gets everybody to look at not only their own submissions, but others that they didn't have the benefit of seeing previously. So, once you see the other views you might refine your own or not, and then I would encourage people as they come back, I think that's a great idea.

To also just tack on a comment as to whether they agree with the way that we're proposing to move forward. And, very simple point, be happy with the way we're going to move forward. We have concern the lack of agreement or the lack of consensus amongst the commentary that's been received, and do you have any views on, and this is for all of our working group members, do we have any views on how we handle that moving forward?

Because that is very important because a lot teams start dropping the straw, and they need that level of guidance, they need that indication of what is the best way to start analyzing this. I also want to chip in on the point that Bart made. Yes, he's absolutely right, as we came out of the study group into this working group, we're not even talking about respective policy processes because that's not our position as a group to do so.

But that's not to say, I mean, he's correct that we are looking at some sort of harmonized definition or framework. In other words, it is within our remit to say a harmonized definition of framework would actually cover the agreed usage that we've talked about and to let it go, or the lack of an agreed usage or understanding of the terms of the three-letter codes.

So within that, while we can't affect policy processes, you know, it's the definitional framework that we can work on. And, as a number have said on the call, it's not a failure for us to walk away and say when it comes to three-letter codes, there isn't that level of clarity. But, you know, I don't want to skew the group's views too much. But I just wanted (unintelligible).

Heather Dryden: Paul that's helpful. Thank you very much. I appreciate your comments. Carlos, I've noted, just for the benefit of those who aren't on the (adobe), your question can we count on feedback for the (unintelligible) for the next call in two weeks? I would like to think that. So, we have some other comments in the chat, but leave it as summary for now. In other words, let's not try and refashion the words of others into a common position.

But I do think we're in a position to be able to say that we can potentially go back and confirm in two weeks' time, everyone in the group can confirm yes I've reviewed my own comments, or I've reviewed my group's comments. I agree that it's been accurately presented.

And, I think Paul makes a point, one other point of feedback could be done on the list between now and our next call, is to say that we as individual group members, do you have concerns with Paul's question? Do you have concerns about the level of diversity and responsibility?

And is that a predictable thing to you? Is there something we should be doing about that? I think that would be very, very helpful just to get our own understanding as a full committee working group for the diversity of the responses and how we tackle that.

And I also think it would be helpful perhaps we initiate it to take these three things on. The third thing to take on would be how would you propose to go forward? I think one that we want to say as co-chairs that came out of our co-chair's meeting recently was, we're not here to drive the ship. We're here as an administrative function here.



You know, in the sense we and staff serve a very similar role in a sense that we're here to herd the pets and try and keep us on track and on our charter. That's all we're doing. We're not here to give any sort of super substantive position that ranks above anyone else's, you know, by complete contract. We are members of the group. We're just tasked with administrative herding functions.

So, perhaps to the extent that we can all, each of us come back before the next meeting, preferably on the list, with those three things. One, if you or your group has made a comment, then get I agree, I've seen that my response is accurately communicated, or accurately represented. Two, how do you feel about the diversity of views? Are you comfortable with that? Are you uncomfortable with that? Is that expected? Unexpected?

Three, how do you propose we go forward given your views on that diversity? How do you propose that we go forward? I think that would be the most helpful in terms of Carlos's, you know, can we have a straw man in order to get there? I think we need those three things, and it needs to be us, as a group working together, rather than a few of us, and Carlos as we produce those (unintelligible), and Bart has been very helpful. Bart, thank you for your striving of excellence in the (unintelligible) window. So, how does that work for everyone?

Gregory, please I see your hand. Thank you. Gregory? You might be on mute. There we go. Good. It looks promising if you could join us Gregory, but we don't hear you. May I just confirm, am I the only one that can't hear? It might be me that's off again.

Bart Boswinkel: No. It's not just you Heather.

Heather Dryden: Great Bart. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Heather Dryden: All right. Well, I see we have some comments in the chat, the three-point (unintelligible) work. Gregory, your hand is up again, let's give it a try. Unfortunately, we have silence again. It might be that the best approach is to put your comment into the chat and I'll be very happy to read it out. Good. Excellent. So, we'll wait for Gregory to type his comment in. I'll be very happy to read it out. Gregory agrees, okay I see. Okay. (Unintelligible) and the number of comments along the way, half of it's a three-point suggestion.

It does mean that we have a fair bit of work to do, you know, really for the next meeting to be effective, we each need to have followed through on our three points. And that includes the co-chairs and yeah all of us working together. So what we then hope to get out of our next meeting, I suppose now unless anyone has anything to add on point two, we're onto our point three, which is next steps.

So to answer our three points, I think on the basis of the response, I wouldn't like to predetermine where we go from there. But on the basis of the three bit of responses that we all made to those three points, we'll be able to chart a very clear plan to Marrakesh. For example, if there are some grave concerns that come out of number two, is it a problem that there is this diversity or something like this, then that's going to suggest we're a little bit slower in what we do between now and Marrakesh.

If there is a very healthy response to number three suggestions as to how we move forward, then that's going to greatly expedite our work to Marrakesh. So, please answer it substantively as we can. And (Unintelligible) makes a very good point in the chat. And I would suggest to spell out in the general observations what status quo really means. I've had some questions about this and that would be helpful.

So, one of the things that we need to do is what we have done for the two-letter codes, which is to say that the frontend of our report on two-letter codes set out here are the current policy positions. Here's where things stand now. And perhaps what we did was we anticipated that we'd be working on that while we receive the feedback from the community, and I think we got diverted a little bit by the holidays and end-of-year and IANA and this sort of thing.

We need to go back and do that housekeeping as well. (Unintelligible) has largely driven our documentation efforts, how would that be helpful? Should we put together a sub team to work on that status quo section of our report? Would that be useful?

Man: Yeah, I think that would probably be easier than (unintelligible) to proceed.

Heather Dryden: Okay. With that in mind, do we have any, Bart please, go ahead, go ahead.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, just too, and maybe this is more of a question for Anna Beth as well, but for the full group, and specifically for Anna Beth, if you talk about the status quo, what is to say, if you'll recall one of the first things the working group did was going back to the study group report and record and reconfirm the current policy status. Is this what you mean by status quo, or something else?

Because if you'll recall there have been no changes as far as I know, but the working group spent some considerable time in checking whether the policy as documented by the study group is still the current policy.

Heather Dryden: Good question Bart. I think in addition to confirming that the policy is still current policy, and I agree with you, we haven't had policy changes. What we do have is examples from the 2012 (Unintelligible) round we made reference to, let's say the implementation of policy and any changes in that

implementation in our report on the two that oppose. So I think it would be helpful to note both of those things.

Let's just confirm quickly that there isn't officially policy changes, of course we know there aren't, and have a think on the question that's been raised by, I have to look in the chat and see if I can find it, someone asked about examples of (unintelligible) use of those three letters, oh it was Nigel. The question about (unintelligible), so we can pick up on that so that we're all on the same page and capture that in our documentation.

I am aware that there are a number of us that have been with this issue for a very long time, and know some of the background, and then there are some of us who come to new. Perhaps if you have lived with this for a long time, it would be helpful if you volunteered for this sub team to help to craft this together and relax.

I know Larson and Bart are both swamped with all kinds of things. They will ask you for your help if you are willing to capture these things and put something together. So if you are keen to volunteer, to capture the status quo, what is the policy today, and the implementation of that policy today with any specific examples, then that would be very helpful. Thank you. Bart I see your hand. Is that an old hand or a new hand?

Bart Boswinkel: Because I'm talking I forget to take it down. It's an old hand.

Heather Dryden: Perfect, not to worry Bart, not to worry. And Anna Beth I see your comment in the chat. Your audio is bad, you're trying to write, and we'll wait for you. And I'll be happy to read out your comments, and you had suggested earlier, oh no sorry I read that one out. And Collin if I haven't answered your question in the chat, you asked, this might be a question for the veteran member group. This seems like a very diverse group.

Am I wrong to think that was the case? And I've answered you you're quite right, it was an intention to make this a cross-community working group rather than keeping it within simply the ccNSO or the GNSO or any particular group. The point was to try and get a community, a cross-community view on this so as to try, and Bart has very helpfully pointed back to the specific language, see if it's feasible to assess the feasibility of putting together a definitional framework.

Anna was great; we've got your comment then. Anything further on this? Silence? Mark, Bart are you happy with where we are at the moment?

Man: Yes, all good from our side.

Heather Dryden: Great.

Paul Szyndler: Heather, it's Paul, just one quick admin point?

Heather Dryden: Yes, please Paul.

Paul Szyndler: Just a point of administration, your three questions were very clearly captured and Bart (unintelligible) send that out to the full membership of the group ASAP because we've got a fairly healthy attendance on this call, but that's not everybody. And it would also serve as a good admin memoir for anybody considering responding to those questions.

Heather Dryden: Good suggestion. Thank you very much.

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Heather, so what I'll do is I'll tidy-up the notes tomorrow morning my time, and I'll send the full notes including the questions to the group. So, those who have not attended or were not able to attend this call will be informed of the discussion, et cetera, as I did last time as well.

Heather Dryden: Great. Thank you Bart. So, the approach then, and Paul I'm just picking up on your comment in the chat since you couldn't hear, and the notes from today's call and those three particular action items that we've discussed will be circulated tomorrow roughly. And around on the list it has been noted that we do have a very good attendance for today's call and that's brilliant, a great start for 2016.

But there are, of course, some assistants that are not with us today, so by sending that out on the list, we'll capture those. Please go ahead and respond to the email, just put your comments for those three points up on the list, and the sooner the better. If you wait until a day or two before our next meeting, then we won't necessarily have the proper chance to digest it. And, of course, given that our meetings are early in the week, it means that we'll spend our weekends reading through comments when things get posted to the list on a Friday afternoon for example.

So, try and do this, the sooner the better as Bart has rightly noted in the notes, and for a procedural point of view, let's say Mark, Bart don't try and capture all of those things. Let's not make another document just a summary of comments. Let's read it to the members. Each of us needs to be responsible for reading through the responses that are received to those three action items, so let's come prepared to discuss those action items.

Staff, we have enough to do, don't try and summarize those responses to those three action items. Ross, I see you have another point for any other business. Please, go ahead.

Man: Thank you. This is a complete change of subject. I hope that is okay. I just had an internal ping from a staff supporting the deck on one of our favorite subjects. And they would very much like to see a meeting with us in Marrakesh, and it's likely, so this is just a preview of what's to come. It's likely

that they would suggest a Sunday afternoon meeting with I believe the leadership of our group.

And I have no further details yet. I know that at least from Carlos and Heather perspective of myself (unintelligible) GNSO choosing meetings on Sunday afternoon that they are meeting with the GAC in fact, but I presuming this meeting with our group would be earlier, so that there might be issues with coordinating an overlap. And I'll be working with that behind the scenes with the staff, with the GAC staff. But I just want to give you the head's up that they are keen to meet and keep the communication channels open. Thanks.

Heather Dryden: That's very helpful Ross. From my perspective I would say let's not make this a meeting of just the co-chairs. The co-chairs only represent some of the views here, so I think to the extent that we can, and perhaps we use a (unintelligible) poll or something, let's try and open this up to the whole group number one. Number two, do you know from the ping is it just the, let's say the leadership of the GAC? Is it the leadership of that working group? Is it the whole GAC? Who wants to meet with us? Can you figure that out?

Man: This is not confirmed, but as I understand it, it would be the whole of the GAC. There would be a similar forum to what normally happens when the GNSO meets, for those members of the GNSO, meets with the GAC on this on, you know, our CWG would in its entirety or, you know, just some of us go into the GAC room and have it assessed in there with everybody present. Obviously, that would be the leadership of the GAC on the panel, but the members of the GAC all in the room. I think that is their forum they would have in mind, but I will confirm this as soon as we get more information.

Heather Dryden: That's significant progress if that's the case, that we have, I think that one concern that I've had all along, and we articulated as group, the number of times and the number of different (unintelligible) is if the broader GAC aware of this because this started out as sub team working group with the GAC to save their efforts, and then became a working group but it still wasn't really

clear from some of those broader presentations that the whole of the GAC was onboard.

So, I think to the extent that we have a meeting with the whole of the GAC, and our entire group, that's a very significant step forward, that's my personal view. Great. Let's see how we can schedule to get the best possible representation from our side and theirs. And Anna Beth has noted in the chat, I think they started to get aware in Dublin, and I think that's quite an accurate statement, and let's keep that going. So, Mark we leave that in your capable hands. Whatever we can do to get as many of us in a room as possible I think would be a great thing.

Any other points, any other business before we wind up for today? (Unintelligible) agrees with Anna Beth in the chat, and any final comments from anyone? Hearing none, 8:54 in my time zone, all the way at the end of the earth, we'll call the meeting to a close. Thank you very much everyone for attending. Bart thanks for your excellent scribing and for circulating those notes, Ross thank you very much for keeping us on track, and then all the best for the New Year everyone.

Oh, Ross sorry; one point, it makes that 2155 Bart. Ross, can you remind us of our next meeting is in two weeks, is it?

Man: Two weeks from today, yes that's correct Heather.

Heather Dryden: Perfect. Off we go, and everyone have a lovely day, all the best for the New Year, and we'll see you soon. Bye now.

Man: Thank you again Heather.

Man: Thanks for everybody. Bye-bye.



Woman: Thank you. Today's meeting has been adjourned. Operator, you can now stop the recording. Please remember to disconnect all of the remaining lines and enjoy the rest of your day.

END