

**ICANN Transcription – Abu Dhabi  
GNSO- New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Face-to-Face Session II –  
Work Track 5 on Geographic Names at the Top Level Part 2  
Wednesday, 01 November 2017 10:30 GST**

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.

On page: <https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Jeff Neuman: Okay. I'm going to look back at the Tech Team, see if we are ready to get - yes, there's a thumbs up, great. This is Jeff Neuman. Welcome back to the second part of our session. I just want to say that in - how many minutes should we give at these pods that will be replaced?

Jeff Neuman: Okay. You have three minutes to put anything in these pods on the Adobe Connect. If you have not put them in yet. Other than the general chat, the other pods are going to disappear and be replaced with new ones. So in a couple minutes I'll look to ICANN staff to switch out the pods to what we're talking about. All of this is being captured. All of this will be presented in the form of notes, back in the form that they are. And so these are not lost. They're not disappearing forever.

The other thing as we go through this what I want everyone to focus on is not their recommendations on how things can be handled or what we say solutioning? We're not trying to develop solutions right now. All we're trying

to do is to figure out the questions, the issues, so that when we take them back, we can figure out the scope.

We can always - the other point is we're expansive right now. We're being very broad. But at some point, we will go through an exercise of narrowing down the scope. But for now, please feel free to mention anything that you feel should be in the scope or whatever items we have going forward.

And we ultimately do want your view as to whether you believe it should be or should not be in scope. But how to solve the situation, whether they're lists, whether there's a repository, whether there's consent required, whether there's on a reserve list, we're not going to delve into that right now.

Those will become important discussions for the group. But I think that's already solving the problem or trying to solve the problem before fully defining what the problem is. And we will be spending lots of time right now and in the future weeks when we develop a scope, trying to figure out what are the problems that we are going to address.

So I would ask everyone, they're good comments that we've gotten so far, but to the extent that we can focus on the issues and the problems, as opposed to the solutions, that would be fantastic. So hopefully, I've given enough time. The queue has myself and Michael Flemming. And I'm - my name's accidentally up there. Michael, are you - oops, I'm meant to take mine down. Sorry.

Woman 1: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So we do have a couple of people still from the previous queue. And then, we'll go onto this. And in the meantime, ICANN staff will start changing around the pods.

Olga Cavalli Thank you, Jeff. I have Jorge in the queue, and Cheryl, and maybe someone else? Jorge?

Jorge Cancio: Thank you, (Olga). Jorge Cancio for the record. I think that Michael made my point earlier in the sense that, with the non-objection framework, we had for most of the geo names on the AGB, was really an enabling framework which got all types together and allowed for the subsidiarity and how the TLD applications went forward with different kinds of agreements between the government and the applicants.

So I think that this is one specific solution. But it links very well with the goal of arriving at a framework that is agreeable to all that allows for a fair say and a fair participation of all parties that have stakes on a specific string and a geo name. And this, I think, should be considered in our way forward. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli Thank you. Cheryl? She's not here. Anyone else want to comment on what we talked about? Katrin?

Katrin Ohlmer: Thank you. Katrin Ohlmer, for the record. I would like to propose to really talk about the issues and problems to define cases of the previous round. So, for instance, we had some clients who wished to apply for us on a string. And for some, we recommended to go forward for them. For some, we did not really recommend forward or rather got to talk with the government. For instance, we could probably define use cases of the previous round to talk about them, what the issue is and how could we find a solution for that issue?

Olga Cavalli Thank you, Katrin. More comments? Do we have someone in the Adobe Connect? No? So should we continue with the PowerPoint? Okay. So back on the key points, this is related with a point made by Jorge, reviewing what was in the Applicant Guidebook.

And so, this is a list of the - what was included in Module 2 of the Applicant Guidebook Provisions Regarding Geographic Names. So this is the all two-character ASCII list; three-character ASCII on ISO 3166-1 list; country and territory names on ISO 3166-1 list, and as commonly known, sub-national places on ISO 3166-2 list; capital city names of countries or territories; city names; regions on UNESCO list or United Nations Statistical Division Regions list. So that was included in the Applicant Guidebook.

And, as we know, there were some conflicts related with names that are not in this list. I remember that if we could count what was included in this list, we're about 5000 names that were included. But it proved to be perhaps not enough. So there were some conflicts after the first round. And I think this is my part? Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. So thank you. This is Jeff Neuman. So now, if you look on Adobe, we have several pods opened up. And what we're going to spend the next few minutes on is to talk about, you know, what in your mind worked, what didn't work, and what changes are needed.

I really want to focus on the first two of those questions, which is what worked and what didn't work, and not focus so much on the changes that are needed because that's really part of the solution, and that's what the group will spend a lot of time talking about after today.

So again, these are the provisions that were in the guidebook. (Olga) has already said, you know, one of the things that didn't work was that it didn't cover all types of - I don't mean to restate it, but it didn't cover all types of what some believe to be geographic names. Again, I'm trying to be diplomatic because I know that there's different sides.

So does anybody want to discuss, you know, the first - the good part? You know, what worked? What actually is good about the provisions in the guidebook? Anything? Nothing?

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So I know that there's comments in here. But I'd rather, at this point, so people could focus on the general chat. So I see Liz. I see Jorge. Is there anyone else that I missed? And (Jim). Okay. So we'll go Liz, Jorge, and then (Jim).

Liz Williams: Thank you, Jeff. Liz Williams. I'm really pleased that you're focusing on what worked, because then, thinking about all of this, there are many things that didn't, that I really would have said that a lot of people put a lot of time and their very best efforts into trying to be objective, into trying to be inclusive, into trying to have a system that enabled the method level, as to achieve the goals around competition; around choice; around diversity.

And so, I'm feeling very much that a lot was done very well, with a good heart. And so, I think everybody that was involved, and that should take great credit from it. The other side of it then is to think about - once we've seen the process entrained, and we objectively analyzed where we could have had less stress, where we could have had less conflict, less confrontation, and for me, that all comes down to clarity, but not just clarity because I think it's a good idea or the person (unintelligible) thinks it's a good idea, or anyone else in this room thinks it's a good idea.

The clarity has to come around that there is trust in the process, that there is trust when there is a dispute, it will be resolved correctly, precisely, and in a timely way that doesn't burden potential applicants who are innovative, who are investing, who are seeking opportunity, but it doesn't kill them in the process.

So this list is, you know, great. No problem. But I think we have a lot more work to do on being more positive on an assumption that it's okay to apply for

anything, unless, one, two, three lists, and if there is a dispute about entitlement, or usage, or whatever you could think of it.

Entitlement and usage, I think, are the two key things. “Are you entitled to use that name?” and “What are you going to use it for?” are quite interesting little parameters to think about. And so, I’d like us to be thinking about what could work better in the next one is more clarity but not at the expense of shutting down opportunity, not at the expense of shutting down innovation, and not at the expense of shutting down competition.

And for me, those markers of success are not about names under management. They’re about happy end users that (Joe Bloggs) who speaks Khmer can have access to their name, in their script, for them to use, as they wish. So hopefully, what can work in the next iteration of the subsequent procedures is ways in which we can enable, and we can encourage, and we can create, but that we don’t try to shut down at the beginning by exhaustive lists of stuff which are essentially telling people to say, “Too hard. Too expensive. Too difficult. I won’t bother.”

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Liz. We have Jorge, then (Jim). Anyone else in the queue? Oh, (Jim)’s out of the queue now. Okay. Jorge, please.

Jorge Cancio: Thank you. Jorge Cancio, for the record. On what worked, I think I said it before, but I think that the non-objection regime data type through most of these categories really provided for a system that allowed the different parties to come together in a way that is also proportionate to a different set of interests we have, a direct interest on one side of the applicant that is asked to go forward to the government which has a more general interest in taking care of that name for the geo region is used in an acceptable manner.

It is also a way that enables the parties to come up with solutions that are agreeable to them and which may be very different from case to case. So there’s an element of subsidiarity to that that is very useful. And at the same

time, it is a system that I believe that, in general, worked very well, in the sense that it is quite straightforward. You know, you need a non-objection or a support to that. You just have to get that.

There might have been cases, and this goes to the second question where there could be some improvements on the implementation of this principle. But I think that the principle overall was a really very good solution.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Jorge. Anyone else on the what worked? So if I could just take Jorge's comment, he said, one of the things he said is that there were incentives built into the guidebook to encourage discussion with the applicable authority. Were there incentives built in for the applicable authority to have discussions with the applicants? So I see the one side was that there were incentives for one side or for the applicants. But are there incentives in the other way around?

It's just a question. I mean you don't have to answer it now. But I think it's just one of the questions that, that I know that has emerged out of it. And I'm trying to see, there's still time to see if there's anyone else that wants to get into the what worked?

Man: Jeff, could you use maybe a hypothetical example to try and rephrase the question you just asked to help people better understand?

Jeff Neuman: Okay. One of - while people are coming up and thinking about what worked, and then, we'll go to what didn't work, I'm sure there's a lot of people there. Jorge had made a really good point that what worked in the guidebook was that there were built-in incentives for anyone that applied for all of these names with the exception, I think, all the two-characters were just banned, so that wasn't - but for all the other categories, I believe, the guidebook had a mechanism in there that if someone wanted to use it, they have to get consent by the applicable or a letter of non-objection.

So there was an incentive for the applicant to reach out to the applicable authority. What I asked was that that might have been something that worked, right? So it got applicants to talk to the governments, for example. But did the Applicant Guidebook provide incentives for the government to talk to the applicant and try to come up with a solution, either to go forward or not? So if someone applied - (unintelligible) something that wasn't applied for, okay.

My hometown of East Northport, New York, so if someone has applied for East Northport, right, and let's say I wish that that was included in one of these, which it's not, but let's say it was, then I would have to go to the government of East Northport and ask them for a letter of non-objection or consent.

They could either just say, you know, "Who the heck are you? Go away." They could just never respond, or they could provide the letter of non-objection and support, or they could provide the letter but only based on certain conditions, right? So there's a bunch of different options.

So my question was that Jorge had said that there were good incentives in there for the applicants that actually go to the governmental authority to get their consent or non-objection. But is there any incentive for the government to actually talk to the applicant to work out a way that they can proceed or even to just respond and say, "No way."? And so, it's a one-way incentive at this point. Are there ways that we can provide incentives for both sides to actually come to the table?

And I didn't mean to start a discussion on that because that's really what I try to avoid which is the solutioning. So it did succeed at bringing up a queue. So because I started it, I guess I will go allow this queue. So we got Nick Wenban-Smith, Jorge, (Carlos) and Susan.



Nick Wenban-Smith: Thank you. I think that one of the great successes of the first round is that it was understood that geographic protections was a difficult and complicated area, and there were restrictions on them. And when you step back and look at what happened in the first round and the massive expansion to the top-level domains, by any standard, it's a success.

And you shouldn't beat ourselves up too much that we didn't solve all of the problems first time around. That was a massive expansion. And many people are in a position of having a top-level domain knowledge they wouldn't have had if there wasn't some sort of policy statement (unintelligible), so that may have been an area of geo names.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks Nick. I got Jorge, (Carlos), Susan and (Olga).

Jorge Cancio: Okay. May I proceed? Jorge Cancio, for the record. I guess that the incentive which was laid down in the AGB is there to trigger a conversation. And it puts the first burden for starting that conversation on the party which has the most direct and specific interest to go to a party with more general interest. And the fact that, or at least the apparent fact, and this is something we will have to analyze here, that in most or in the large majority of the applications under these rules of non-objection, there was actually a conversation, and there was actually a non-objection being granted.

I think it shows that the mix was the correct one. And probably, it's also due to the professional and the good pitch skills of the applicants that they knew, "Okay, when I'm going to this authority, I will do the right pitch. And if it doesn't really percolate at the first time, I will know at the second time how I have to present that," and that goes also back to the subsidiarity because each culture, each nation, each region is different.

And also the needs from each authority will be different. You may have Nordic countries who - as they have said many times in the GAC, they don't really care about this. They have a very liberal approach. Other countries

like mine where we have certain protections for certain of these names; and other countries where you have really very strong feelings for these kinds of names.

So also the pitch will depend on that. And depending on how you start the conversation, of course, the incentives from the government will be adequate to continue the conversation. But going back to the beginning of my intervention, it seems at least that, in most of these cases, as we haven't really heard about the cases where it absolutely didn't work, it worked. So they really got into the conversation and got to good agreements. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Jorge. And we'll be having a lot more discussions on that kind of thing when the Working Group is talking about solutions and other types of ways to deal with any of the geographic terms that are on our lists. Going to - okay, (Carlos), Susan, and (Olga), and Liz, I see in there.

(Carlos): Thank you. This is (Carlos), for the record. I will try not to get into a discussion, Jeff, but I have to ask maybe in terms of the boundaries or the scope. These questions on this stage are basically focused on the delegation process only. And the experience that we saw in the Competition Review Team is that this process, if good or not, I don't know, brought about a competition for public interest commitments, being voluntary or not.

So the question that you posed is, from my perspective, is not if the process asked for a check with the authorities but the result of that. And the result of that are quite a wide variety of restrictions or conditions in the operation of the TLDs that are not policy-based either. They really happened in part by governments that worried about heavily-regulated industries but also by cities. Some cities were easier than others in terms of allowing using (unintelligible) cologne, or giving cologne and curl at the same time, et cetera.

So my question, are we going to focus only on delegation? Or are we going to have a discussion also on the implications of this process of consultation

with the authorities? For me, that is very important because, to date, the limit of restrictions was more or less set by the ccTLDs. But if today we have more geographic TLDs that they are even more restrictive than ccTLDs, then I would like to expand the chapter in terms of the results of the delegation process. I don't know if that's clear. Thank you very much.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, (Carlos). And one of the benefits of being a Working Group chair is I can turn around and ask you, "Should it be?"

(Carlos): We will have some recommendations in the competition; a report on that, yes.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. So then, I will go to Susan, (Olga) and Liz. Anyone else? Okay. Susan.

Susan Payne: Thanks, Jeff. Susan Payne. Yes. I put my hand up in response to what you were saying - well not in response - as a result of what you were saying about the - did the government have the incentives to be discussing this with the applicant? But I think it was a related point. And it may not have come up in a huge number of cases. But it definitely did come up about, you know, how did the applicant know who they were supposed to be getting permission from? And there was at least one case where they appear to have thought they had permission and they had it from the wrong person or in the wrong format.

And so, I think, you know, if we are, later on, when we're talking about solutions, if we are talking about solutions which are permission-based, we can't be expecting people to have a permission-based system which doesn't also enable them to find the right source for the permission.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, Susan. Great comment. And I would put that in the category of, while it may have worked, that there were - it was a requirement for a letter of non-objection or consent. What didn't work is that there was no

guidance given as to who to give that. Is that what you're trying - sort of saying? I'm trying to put it in different categories here. So, okay, next, we have (Olga), and then, Liz.

Olga Cavalli

Thank you, Jeff. I would like to agree with Susan that the fact of having the right source to be consulted should be an important issue and that should be addressed somehow.

I would like to follow up from what Jorge said. He covered most of what I wanted to say, but he said something very important; how you start the conversation. So when - from the governmental perspective, if you just realize that a significant name for the country or the region has already been requested, and you were never consulted, then it's a different point of starting the conversation if you were consulted before, because the applicants thought that that could be a sensitive issue for the government. So these are different points for starting the conversation.

If the government already saw that the string was requested, then why, because the applicants thought that it was not included in one of these lists, which is a good reason for me, but - and somehow thought that this name was available, which is a way of looking at it. And then, the country thinks that that was wrong. So this is a different point, if the applicant went before and asked for some kind of agreement, or permission, or opinion from the country. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman:

Thanks, (Olga). And I recognize we're getting into some solutions. So really, please try to focus. I know we're going back to Liz, and then, Katrin. Let's focus on issues; what worked; what didn't work. Let's not solve it right now. So thank you.

Liz Williams:

Liz Williams. Jeff, you'll be pleased that I'm going to say something around what did work. What worked but perhaps not to the satisfaction of everybody was that the way in which the whole process was priced and the financial

investment that was made has dramatically changed the nature and scope and fortunes of ICANN -- sorry; sorry about that -- fortunes of ICANN as an institution.

So that has - that large sums of money that filtered into the organization, and that have been attributed to the (unintelligible) proceeds, have been attributed to those really special funds of money, is something that worked. Now, you might not agree with what the money is for or how it's distributed. So that really changed the way the organization was actually doing its business. And I think that's something that's interesting.

What it might also do, it's not because of geographic names and it's not because of what we're discussing here, but what didn't work was exactly the same thing -- cost, time and uncertainty. So when we are looking at ways in which we can perhaps not be talking about solutions but to think about the issues around what didn't work was for applicants' time, cost and uncertainty.

And then, linking it directly to what we're talking about today in terms of what I'm going to just generally call, geographic terms, perhaps we could put our thinking caps on about the distribution of funds that is thought through carefully and that is correct, and that it's properly governed, may well be an opportunity for there to be more of these kinds of names applied for.

It could be an opportunity for increasing participation. It could be an opportunity for encouraging innovation and more expression of different kinds of - if we go to the much more previous slide about cultural expressions and economic expressions of what might be in a TLD, then I think, in the back of our minds, what would be useful to think about, the way in which this 2012 round was, can be used to trigger new opportunity in any subsequent round.

And that reaches into underserved regions. It reaches into underserved linguistic communities. It reaches into economic activity that is very local and very specific. And we may not be thinking in geographic terms, in terms of

large corporate interests in applying for names because they want to have them, but that this next process can be much more focused on just in this context about enabling, about enabling and about assisting because there is money available. But I don't know how to do that. So that's the what worked and what didn't work, but no solution about how to move forward.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Liz. And a lot of that conversation is relevant. So I'm going to make a plug for Christa Taylor and Sarah Bockey who are the co-work chair leads of Work Track 1. And in that Work Track, they are discussing things like fees, and funds, and all that kind of stuff in Applicant Support. So all of those - some of those comments related a lot to what they're working on in that Work Track. And I'm sure they would love to hear some of those reflect - some of your comments reflected in their Work Tracks. I have Liz, and then, Katrin.

Katrin Ohlmer: Thanks. Katrin Ohlmer. I would like to add a few points on the letter of support or non-objection. So what worked pretty well, I think, was that the letter has been worded very clear. So there was not the issue of what is it all about, as we had with the COI, or we had a lot of hassle in terms of what especially is meant to provide. So I think this is brought up well.

One thought was if we have a government which is supposed to give support or non-objection, if this was written in English, how about translating that probably for the next round to other languages to be an official letter by ICANN and give the government a better feeling on what they're supposed to sign, if it's not their mother language.

And also, one topic about one or more support letters, I think we saw the case of dot Africa and several other cases where more than one support letter have been issued and by different entities, and, at the same time, by the same entities for other cities. So I think we have one case in Japan, if I remember correctly, where the city issued more than one support letter. So this might be a topic for improvement in the next round, so.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks. I see a clear queue on this, just looking around for a last call on this. And okay, do we still have Avri in the room? Is Avri Doria still in the room? Avri, can you stand, please? I'm going to take a little break from the - what we've been working on. And I just should have done this the other day. But I wanted to really thank Avri, now that she's moved onto the board. Avri was one of the overall co-chairs of our Working Group. She's now moved onto the board.

And I just wanted to really take this time to express my gratitude. Avri and I have known each other for a number of years. And we started out a little bit at odds, to say the least, a number of years ago. But I think, over the last number of years, we've really worked well together. And I really just couldn't have gotten this far without Avri's help. And I think we made a great team. And so, I just wanted to personally thank Avri for that and for her leadership, and to just give her a round of applause for everything she has done for us.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And I'm still going to be around. I'm going to be a member of the group. I'm going to be a part of Work Track 5 as a participant. So I'm not going all that far away. But thank you very much.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Avri. Okay. Now back to our program, I think we are going to go to the next topic.

Man: We've got Christa (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Oh, I'm sorry, Christa. I didn't see you. Sorry, Christa, please.

Christa Taylor: Thanks. This is Christa, for the record. During our conversations here, some of the issues that were brought up in Applicant Support are for, say, smaller countries or, specifically, it was the Caribbean that was brought up that would be interested in, say, a geographic name. But the business plan is harder to justify.

And if they came through Applicant Support, what are the concerns around that, being that they are a smaller country? And whether or not somebody who went through Applicant Support would be given a different priority over, say, somebody else, if they also went in for the same thing? So there could be a little bit of overlap between a geographic name and Applicant Support. And I just thought I'd note that here. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Christa. And we are going to note that as a dependency. So we've got to make sure we indicate that in the - even in the terms of reference, that might be a good thing to point out. Okay. Anyone else left in the queue? Michael will be the last - wait, before Michael, I'm going to close the queue. Anyone else before we move on? Okay. Michael.

Michael Flemming: Just a quick clarification question, I think - I'm sorry, Michael Flemming, GMO Brights Consulting, Work Track 2, Co-Chair and speaking in that capacity in this. A question on clarification, and I think it would be good for Jeff to or Cheryl to address.

Reserved Names is currently within the Working Track 2 scope. And noting that we're talking - we had a little bit of discussion about dependencies, can you kindly explain how this has kind of been shifted outside of that and whether or not those two will go back together at the same time?

Jeff Neuman: Sure. Thanks, Michael. So - I'm sorry, this is Jeff Neuman. Originally, as you said, this was part of Work Track 2 because some of the names were reserved in a sense that they were not allowed to be applied for like the two-character. Some of the names were also, as you said, either needed a letter of non-objection or support, so those were also, at least initially, within Work Track 2.

Right now, we've pulled all of that out of Work Track 2. And so, it's going to be exclusively within Work Track 5, at least at the top level. And so, at this point, there's no need to go back to Work Track 2, unless someone,



somewhere down the line, thinks there is a reason. So at this point, it's not (unintelligible).

Woman 1: It's okay.

Jeff Neuman: Yes?

Man: I just want to make sure I don't have (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So this is an exclusive Work Track 5. Okay. Moving on, if we can go to slides and the next person is Martin.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Jeff. Martin Sutton. And this is just an opportunity to go back through some of the items covered by Jeff, but in a bit more detail for rules of engagement. So there were some interesting discussions earlier. And this is really to make sure people fully are aware of how the process works and how to contribute to this. So if we move on the slides, please?

Cheryl Landon-Orr: And just on - Cheryl Landon-Orr, for the record - just on the slides we're moving, the existing pods will become invisible, and new ones with new questions will appear. You're not being lost, but they are becoming invisible.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Cheryl. And so, if we could move onto the next slide?

Cheryl Landon-Orr: One more slide... (Unintelligible).

Martin Sutton: So while the slides are coming up, say, this is open to anybody, the Working Track. So anyone can join as a member and are very welcome to join the group as a Working Track member. A member can participate during the meetings and messages on the list, et cetera, and then fully engaged. Others can be an observer to the group. So you can monitor the e-mail traffic at your leisure.

And then, membership in the overall PDP Working Group is not required. It's probably a preference but - so you can see everything else going on within the policy work. But it is - they're not a requirement. So you can just take part within the Working Track 5 explicitly.

What we do ask though is that, for anybody that joins the Work Track is, that you submit a statement of interest. So as you enter the list, and I think we've had - the count this morning was about 80 odd, I think, that had joined up as members to the list. And then, you can submit a statement of interest during the course of that process. That's important because then, obviously, everybody is visible and transparent as to who is there and what's their background and affiliations.

Let's be clear though that there is the member and observer status. And it's the members that get included in the consensus call. So those that have participated and worked through the processes and the discussions are the ones then that will be included on the consensus calls. And Jeff walked through that earlier. These are normally more than one reading, at least more than - at least two readings before a consensus call is concluded. Thank you. Next slide?

So the decision-making process that Jeff talked about earlier, it's got a - we've got to make sure that it was comfortable (unintelligible) understand it. So this is going to be an opportunity today. If you've got any concerns or questions beyond those that were discussed earlier, please feed them in. And we've got the Adobe Connect boxes to start pushing that into. So if you have got any comments, we'll start going through that in a minute. But it is all conducted under the GNSO operating procedures which are available. We've gone through this slide already. So I won't repeat this.

What we're really looking for though is to make sure that we're inclusive, just to make sure that we capture any thoughts and comments on how do we ensure all ideas are considered across the broad community and from the

particular SOs and ACs that are represented? So I'm happy to take some questions or comments, either on the mic or start populating the Adobe Connect?

Jeff Neuman: So Martin, this is Jeff Neuman. Just to read what's in the Adobe Connect, this is important for all of us. I know it may seem non-substantive for a lot of you. But we really want to make sure that we run a - repeating the entire leadership of the Working Group and the Work Track to make sure that we run an effective group.

And so, the questions that appear in the pod are "How do we ensure all ideas are considered?", "What are your concerns about the engagement model?", and "What are your expectations of the Work Track co-leads?" And I guess I'll add to that, the overall Working Group chairs, if you want to put...

Cheryl Landon-Orr: No, we don't want to hear anything about that.

Jeff Neuman: Cheryl, I guess, expects to hear a lot about how she can do better. But I'd also love to hear about how I could do better. So if you could please populate those, I know, even though it's not anonymous, so we know who you are, if you could please populate that...

Cheryl Landon-Orr: I would be taking those.

Jeff Neuman: I'll let Martin control the queue. I'll just write it down.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. The mic, please?

Marita Moll: Hi. Marita Moll, NCUC, At-Large, and TeleCommunities Canada, in Canada, which is a group of community-networking people across the country. One thing that occurs to me, just thinking about reaching out, if we can reach out outside of our rooms and bring the opinions of the people out there into this forum. Now, I know, of course, I can, you know, talk to them, and then, I can

bring that as me. I'm just wondering whether or not it's closer to bring the opinion of someone out there to this process as the opinion of someone out there; that person's not actually a participant or as an SOI. Does that happen?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. This is Jeff Neuman. That happens all the time. So if there is a particular topic that we're discussing, but you know that that person or group is not a member, there are a couple of things you can do.

One is you can just submit the statement on their behalf, as long as you indicate that. The second thing we've done is we've invited them on a call, so as kind of a special guest of ours. So we recently did this with - there was an issue in Work Track 2, for example, on closed generics, you know, that one company applying for a term, to use exclusively for itself, and that term happens to be a dictionary word.

There were several people that were vocal during the 2012 round but we're not members of the group. So we saw their statements, and we've invited those people to that one call without any obligation to join the group. So absolutely, the only thing we ask is that, when you're making that statement, you make it clear that it's on their behalf, if you're the one making the statement. But we'd love to actually have statements from them directly or even on a call. Thank you.

Marita Moll: Okay. That's very helpful. Thank you. I will try to facilitate some of that sort of thing if I can.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. And I've got a queue forming here. I've got Michael Flemming. So I have a queue of one. Any more that want to - Liz? Okay. Michael?

Michael Flemming: Michael Flemming here and - I'm sorry, Michael Flemming, Work Track 2. To follow up on what Jeff said, actually, when we did invite those special

people, they actually did join the Working Track 2 after that. So it's a good way to recruit new members.

Just a point on engagement, but there's a lot of good ideas floating into the chat. I just want to echo vocally the rotation of calls. I'm sure we'll be having that. But we've had a really good rotation of calls for all the Working Tracks so far, but the best way to encourage participation across the globe, so thank you.

Martin Sutton: Thank you, Michael. Liz?

Liz Williams: Liz Williams. Martin, just a question. A long time ago, we did have in the PDP round the possibility of bringing in external experts for doing certain things. Is that an intention in this - I mean we'd all expect we can all do stuff. We could probably send a rocket to the moon. But this is deeply complex when we get into thinking about how to do stuff. Is there a budget? Is there an intention? Is it necessary? When is it necessary? If it's not, then also, fine, but it would be just helpful to know if there was that option, if we get stuck, because generally, that might help us get unstuck.

Martin Sutton: The top-level knowledge, Jeff is just going to cover those other aspects. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: So I'll address the expert points. Yes. There still is built into the PDP an option for us to bring in outside experts. So whether we bring them in or not is a discussion that needs to take place within the Work Track.

The budget issue is a little bit more complicated one. There is some budget built in - oh, sorry, there's a lot of reverberation here. There's some budget built in the GNSO, in for the GNSO, so as a whole, for policy development activities. If we come up with a project that we need funding for, that would have to be taken up to the GNSO Council.

And we'd have to have a strict plan as to what that budget would be, why we'd want to use it, and then, ultimately, it's up to the council to either take that out of its existing fund, if there is an existing one or any left, or to make a request for additional funding, so to the extent that we can, as early as possible, just offer this to the Work Track leads.

If we think that we need budget for anything like outside experts, whether legal or otherwise, or we think we need face-to-face meetings or whatever it is, to start thinking about that now, so that we can - because the other processes take a long time, and even think a year ahead to the point where this may be a request for next year's budget, or the following year, because ICANN works on a July-to-June timeframe.

So this even could be a thought, if you're thinking ahead to 2018, and think you want to do a face-to-face or an expert (unintelligible) in July, then that would be something that would feed into the budget discussions going on now and for the next several months on the following fiscal year. So that's something for you all to think about.

Martin Sutton: Yes, Liz?

Liz Williams: I'm just going to ask then a supplementary question. Liz Williams, again, for the recording. One of the things that I think would be really helpful to have is some economic and financial analysis and advice, which balances -- and I haven't thought about the scope of that correctly yet or the hypothesis that you wish to prove -- but one of the things, I think, how we make decisions about what could be in or out depends on opportunity costs.

What are we trying to achieve? What value would we get out of really understanding a business case or encouraging for the applications? How much would they cost or whatever?

But what I'd like to see are our decisions and our commendations being made on fact and on numerical input, and that takes into account, for example, things like for - let's use Africa as an example for (unintelligible) a better one. Are there limitations on possibilities for applicants for geographic terms that are mitigated against because of currency control, for example? Are there things that are mitigated against because (unintelligible) US dollars, for example?

So not correctly formulated yet, but if we could just pop that in one of the pods, and if we do need to think that we needed expert financial analysis or business case analysis, that might be something we might think is a good idea, to help in some way down the track.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Liz. So, just to clarify, this is focused on geographic names, but probably also, it's broader than that as well across the generics?

Liz Williams: Yes, I think so. I think so.

Martin Sutton: Okay.

Liz Williams: But I don't know the answer. All I'm saying is that we make a lot of decisions based on gut feel and fairness. And I'd like us to have that other hypothesis of or the other axis of decision-making based around, if we did this, what financial implication does it have for that? Does it have implications for - for example, Katrin brought up the fact that an applicant doesn't know where to go to seek permission in what language?

Now, what - is that a barrier to entry? I believe it is. I believe it is. And we want to lower those barriers to entry, not raise them. So when we can think about ways of mitigating that by understanding cost, and then understanding result, I think we're going to be in a better position to make those decisions.

Martin Sutton: Thanks, Liz. I think that there might be some straddling across different Work Tracks that probably combine that as well that we could leverage to help us focus in on the geographics as well, perhaps not duplicating that effort. There might be something that we could be able to do if there's experts required, in conjunction with the other Work Tracks. Thank you.

I've got a clear queue. There's lots of good practical suggestions coming into the boxes, which I appreciate. Has anybody gotten any comments or questions still about the rules of engagement and decision-making? If not, we shall move on, and I shall hand over to (Christopher), if I may? Thank you.

Christopher: Well the notes from the Secretariat for this section address the question of what are our expectations as to the success in terms of deliverables since reporting? What does success look like? And can we already identify certain preconditions or parameters of how one would assess down the road, assess down the road whether you've got success or not? And if not, what are the risks that we should try and mitigate in this debate to - when we get that?

This is a little bit futurology. But I believe that in terms of, first of all, aiding the co-chairs to understand where we're going, particularly those of us who are not regular participants in the PDP; and some of you who, some of you who have seen success or lack of it in the past. Others among us have not had that experience because this may be the first time that they're part - that you're participating in a Work Track of this kind. So I don't expect everybody to be on the same page on this one. Though would anybody like to kick off? Jeff wants to have - okay.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. I will raise a question that I've been asked several times. Sorry, this is Jeff Neuman. And I see Heather in the queue after me. So let me ask this question that's been asked of me. They say, "Jeff, you know, you're starting this new Work Track 5. There's been a previous Cross-Community Working Group dealing with the use of country/territory names. They were only able



to come to consensus recommendations on one item out of the several.  
What makes you think that this would be any more successful than that?"

So I would ask everyone here, what can we do here to make this effort more successful? Well, first, what would be the definition of success? But then, second, given previous attempts, why do we think this group can actually come to a consensus on recommendations? And what would help us to get to that; successful consensus recommendations?

Christopher: We have Heather Foster? Oh no, Heather Forrest. Sorry, the type is so small here, even with the reading glasses. We'd have Heather Forrest first, then Liz Williams again. Heather, where are you?

Heather Forrest: Here.

Christopher: Okay.

Heather Forrest: Hi there. Thank you. Heather Forrest, for the record. May I address three points, please? I'll be mindful of my admonishment that we shouldn't be filibustering here. I'll do this as quickly as possible.

Number one, in relation to Jeff's specific question about how we can improve on the outcome of the Cross-Community Working Group on the use of country and territory names, the rationale for the conclusion of that group, that it was impossible to develop a harmonized framework, came directly out of the fact that that group had an extremely limited scope. It dealt merely with country and territory names. And we've already gone a very long way in addressing that problem this morning. So I'm quite confident that that should not be a hindrance to this group's work.

In the chat, before we move the chat pods around, I know that there were some very constructive comments made about -- and that chat pod is now gone, just unfortunately -- about how the Work Track leaders could help us to

achieve the aims of this group. And I hope that the Work Track leaders will be able to follow up afterwards in that regard. And I'm afraid I had a third point but I forget what it was. Thank you.

Liz Williams: Sorry, (Christopher).

Christopher: Liz, (unintelligible)?

Liz Williams: No, I was just writing for some notes for myself to be emulating Heather and being precise and quick. One of the biggest risks, I think, we've got is the length of time. And the consequence of that is volunteer burnout, so people want to see that their work is moving smartly towards something.

The question I had is how smartly does Work Track 5 then rejoin the other Work Tracks to come into a (unintelligible) product? It would be helpful to know if and when the timeline incorporates that coming-back-together process. The second piece of that is, is there an obligation for public comments, and if so, at what point? Excuse me.

In this particular context, it struck me that this is an opportunity for deliberate outreach? I don't know how that takes place into the regions, because much of this is around, perhaps, people that don't necessarily participate in these environments that are hugely impacted.

So maybe that's another question. Maybe it's a staff question. Maybe it's a senior-vice-president-engagement-in-the-regions question. But I'd like to really see that deliberate discussion and outreach to get other people's opinions, not in the opinion bubble that we have here.

And then, the last piece is when, and what, and - when are things translated? And when are things sent out for deliberate comment from other places where, perhaps, we don't use English as our first language in this kind of setting?

Christopher: I think some of those questions relate to the staff support. But, Jeff, could you just answer that particular question about how to reintegrate with Work Track 5 work with the other Work Tracks in the future? I think part of that has already been covered. Jeff, just, if you'd like to?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, (Christopher), and like the good overall Working Group chair, I can turn that around and say, "Well, how do you think it should be?" But actually, it's a serious question in a sense of one of the first items will be to develop a work plan of the Work Track. And part of that will be, ultimately, at the end of it, to incorporate all the recommendations of every Work Track have to go before the full Working Group.

So in the Work Track plan, the work plan, there will be - prior to the preliminary report of Work Track 5, the recommendations, if any, that are contained within that preliminary report, will go back to the full Working Group. So, at that point, we'll reintroduce the full Working Group to the recommendations for a period of time.

Then, it goes out for public comments. And the Work Track takes the public comments back with the preliminary report; ultimately comes up with a recommendation for a final report. That, again, will go to the full Working Group to then ultimately send out to the council.

So we will be building in all of those milestones in the work plan. And so, you know, hopefully, we can - recognizing the complexity of a number of the issues, but at the same time, recognizing that there's a desire for the community to get the next round underway. You know, we'll balance those with making sure we get it right in the Work Track, then the work plan. That, again, will be our first deliverable.

Christopher: Yes. Thank you. In my experience, this - as the Secretariat of another group of six, it's time, perhaps, very soon, to guess what the size of the document

will be and put down a placeholder in your translation services, because I don't want to find that when we finally got a report and we need to go out to public consultation, we have to wait another six weeks for the translations, maybe. But we'll take that up to offline. Now, we have Alex Schubert, followed by Annebeth Lange. Alex, where are you?

Woman 1: In here.

Christopher: Oh.

Alex Schubert: It was already said that the scope of the Cross-Constituency Group was simply too narrow. And we have much better chance this year.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, I was just checking the culture in the Cross-Community Working Group, and I agree with Heather, the problems we met. But it's several reasons why we should have a better chance to succeed this time.

One thing is that the result of the group, the Cross-Community Working Group raised interests much wider than we had before. We have that cross-community session in Johannesburg. We see that the interests from a lot of people in all communities have raised, that will help more participation. We really hope for more active participation.

Another thing is that it was the ccNSO that started the Cross-Community Working Group. And we in the ccNSO are not that experienced by doing PDPs or these Working Groups (unintelligible) in the GNSO. And I really must say that I am impressed of the staff and the support we get. And a good secretariat and help from the staff is essential here. And I'm sure that we will get that.

One thing that we can think about is there are a lot of things we're going through. We could discuss that. How long should we discuss each point or each bullet point on the list? We were stopping that three-letter codes and

we never got any further because we didn't find anything out of that. Could it be a solution then to go on and then return to a very difficult point? That's one thing we could think about. Thank you.

Christopher: Heather, you've been very patient, but it's your turn now.

Heather Forrest: I believe Kristina Rosette is in the queue ahead of me.

Kristina Rosette: Heather, go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Kristina. So my previous point, and in the meantime, I have thought of a third point, a fourth point, based on (Chris)'s comments. And apologies, Heather Forrest, for the transcript.

The first one is this. And we have that phrase in the ICANN community, to (voluntel) someone? And we have a really fabulous webinar that we often do; the GNSO Support staff. It was mentioned in one of the chats. But I think it's very helpful in light of the participation comments that have been raised here. And (Emily)'s nodding which means I haven't entirely destroyed the spirit of our fantastic GNSO Support staff.

So may I ask, as a counselor, that the leadership of this Work Track follow up with our fabulous GNSO Support staff, on any help that you might need from other GNSO community participants who might volunteer in the facilitation of that session. I think it would be very opportune. I know we did it at the start of SubPro. Jeff and Avri at that time, made sure that that happened.

But now that we have renewed interest in this group and new participants, I think it would be brilliant. So may I put that down as an action item, please, that we run that webinar? And let's do it in light of the comments in the chat. Let's do it multiple times for time zones, please.

May I ask, in terms of the bullet point here, reporting the four Work Track 5 co-leads will brief the various SOs and ACs? May I ask that when briefing the GNSO, what we particularly are interested to know is not only a very general update, but could you please ask us or advise us of any challenges that you're facing; specifically, any obstacles; any way that you believe the community can help you in facilitating your work?

Very high-level general updates are nice to have. But they're often not the most important information that the community needs. So please, if you could be as specific as possible in those updates and not just a canned presentation, that would be most appreciated. Thank you.

Christopher: And I think that's very sensible and born of experience. Katrina? Is that...?

Woman 1: Kristina.

Christopher: Kristina?

Kristina Rosette: I'm Kristina Rosette, Amazon Registry, and two points; one procedural and one substantive. And with regard to the substantive one, if I understood Liz Williams' intervention earlier, I would be inclined to disagree to the extent that I don't...

While I think it is helpful that we try and perhaps leverage the very significant Global Engagement staff with their somewhat significant budgets to try and bring in new participants to the process, generally, I am reluctant to endorse at this point the idea that we would target potential participants from each region for the purpose of speaking to a specific category of the scope.

In other words, I don't think it's going to be particularly helpful for us to find, for example, that in the Asia-Pacific region, these eight names are of particular sensitivity because, as I understand it, what we are supposed to be

coming up with are general principles that can then be shared and put out for public comments.

It may be that we ultimately end up with a list of names in the various categories. But I think it is going to be most helpful for applicants to have a better understanding of the general principles to lend predictability and certainty.

On the procedural matter, I trust that the briefing that the co-leads are going to be presenting will, A, be done in writing, in terms of the documentation, will be available; B, I think it would be helpful for that to be distributed to the Work Track participants simultaneously.

And finally, I would ask that, in those briefings, if the leads anticipate, specifically for the GNSO, I can't speak to the other SOs, but if they do anticipate that it seems likely that within a month, six weeks, whatever, that there will be a request from the Work Track for funding for an expert, et cetera, signaling that as early as possible because, quite frankly, the council is not, on its own, going to be able to approve that. It's going to have to go back to each of the stakeholder groups.

And so, the more advanced notice that we get of that, provided that there's some degree of precision, so that no one's being asked to write a blank check, the faster, I think, the Work Track is going to get useful input.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks. This is Jeff Newman. And I don't know if Avri is in the queue. Avri, are you going to bring up what I...? Okay. So I will then just bring up one point on the briefings. When we say briefings in here, it sounds a lot more formal than it really is. There's a couple of aspects.

Number one is we always have a newsletter. So that's always going to go out with kind of a description of what's happened in the group and what's to come. The other thing is that, when we say briefings, it's really going to be

up for, up to each supporting organization, how they want briefings from their representatives.

So, in the past, what it's been is, you know, a call with the GNSO Council leadership. And I think those - I'm not sure if those are recorded or not. But certainly, we can request them to be recorded, so that there's an adequate record.

The other types of briefings are just, you know, at meetings like this. So, you know, Martin would go and present to the GNSO Council on the council workday, you know, the status of what's going on.

The real intent of the briefings is to make sure that you're - their supporting organizations and advisory committees are kept up to date, that they're getting opportunity to provide input and not really to make any kind of decisions within that group.

So it's not the intent for, let's say, Martin to go back to the GNSO and get a recommendation from the GNSO, and then deliver that to the group. It's more towards just, you know, what's going on. And so, any other mechanisms that we currently do not already do, I'd be happy to - if you would recommend additional ways, and we've taken note of what Kristina has said. So in the queue, I'll let Avri make the second point that I was probably going to make. And then, we'll go to the next in the queue.

Christopher: Avri, do you need to come in now?

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri Doria, a member of the group. One of the things I used to do when I used to be involved as co-chair in this group, and a sort of an annoying thing I did in every Work Track and in the main group, was constantly remind the group that this was pretty much a status quo-based group. In other words, we have an existing policy.



We have an existing policy that almost no one likes. But we have it. It's what's in the AGB now. It's also, I think, what shows up in several of the letters that came.

So when you're talking about incentives, for finding consensus, and for making the trade-offs, I think that is also one of the strong motivators you've got, that if you can't reach consensus on something new, that sort of deals with all the various issues that everybody's bringing in, then you've got what you've got, and that would be probably a pity, especially if you put a whole lot of work into discussing the various points.

So it's probably the last time I will annoy everybody with the reminder that there is existing policy. If you can't find consensus to change it, and if you can't find consensus on what to change it to, then it's what gets to go forward. Thanks.

Christopher: Thank you, Avri, for those; a salutary warning to us all. Justine Chew, please introduce yourself.

Justine Chew: You just did, (Chris). Hi, Justine Chew from At-Large, for the record. Just to Jeff's point about procedure and to add to Kristina's point, I would make a plea to the co-leaders to have a balance, in terms of the use of the mailing list and the calls specific to the discussion, because I'm from the Asia-Pacific region, and it's - you know, I know it's been said before many times that the times of the calls are horrendous for us in Asia-Pacific. So that's why my plea to you, to ensure that there's a good discussion, a balanced use of both the mailing list and the calls to facilitate discussion. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Justine. I think that's a really good point and a great way to transition over to the next group which is Annebeth who's going to sound a lot like Nick Wenban-Smith. But it's really Annebeth, no matter what it sounds like.

Christopher: Yes, the brief says...

Annebeth Lange: I (unintelligible) today.

Nick Wenban-Smith: Thank you, I think. So Nick Wenban-Smith. That voice was Annebeth's. I think I have now six minutes allocated to do this final wrap-up of next steps. So I will keep it short and sweet. And we all know that the call for our volunteers is currently open. And we have in excess of 80. And I think we've got quite a good sense of broad geographic and constituency representation already, but the more the merrier.

I think Jeff talks through the process about people can join the volunteer later on in any case. So this is the first question about whether the kickoff meeting should be scheduled, I suppose, given though the call for volunteers extends until November 20. The first kickoff session shouldn't be before November 20, but it should be shortly after that.

And I think, going forward, the co-chairs are going to gather with the staff to collect all the inputs from today to produce something fairly promptly and to try to get some placeholders for meetings going forward, just following the closing date for the volunteers.

And the second point there is then meeting frequency. And I know, in the GNSO, sometimes it's every week. Sometimes it's every fortnight. And I think there's an open question here. And I think we're looking for input on how often do the participants who are here or remotely participating feel that there should be meetings, I think that's an open question, right? I don't know whether we want to (unintelligible) in the chat for the purposes of time. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Well I mean I could just - sorry, this is Jeff Neuman. I could just say, generally, the way the other - just to give an introduction, the way the other Work Tracks work is that they have calls every other week. So every two weeks or the fortnight, is that...?

Woman 1: Every fortnight, yes.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, it's a term I don't generally use. Now, I know what it means, every fortnight. But when it comes closer to times of deliverables or meetings, you could make that every week. But I would think that, at this point, it's probably a good idea to set the calls every other week and at rotating times.

Nick Wenban-Smith: Is there any contrary opinion to the fortnightly? I'm pleased to expand, Jeff, the vocabulary. It doesn't happen very often, I don't suppose. But if there is any strongly-held objection to the fortnightly rotating geographic time meeting frequency, then, if not speak now or forever hold your peace. But it would be nice to have the input before the meeting schedule is arranged. And so, just a couple of minutes left, in terms of preparation going forward, let's go to the next slide, I believe?

Woman 1: (Unintelligible).

Nick Wenban-Smith: Oh, cranky, don't let me drive, oh here. So listen - improving homework and background reading, for anybody who is interested in participating, and certainly, if you want to usefully participate, it is extremely helpful because some of the stuff is not intuitive. There's a huge amount of history. Reports are very helpfully summarized, all of the past history, the various discussions going way back to the 2007, when the geographic names and new gTLDs started to be discussed.

A bit of an understanding of the geography, no pun intended, of the landscape of how we got to where we are today is quite helpful in terms of framing the discussions, and they take every point about we didn't start - it's like an Irishman being asked for directions.

You know, we don't start with a blank piece of paper. We have a whole bunch of existing practice, discussions, years of debate, and some existing

policy statements set out in - I wouldn't say there's a guidebook (unintelligible) rules for applying. The new gTLDs have rules for geographic names already, and a full understanding of what they actually are, because the devil is in the detail of some of these.

Have a look at the 3166 standards. It's pretty complicated. When you start looking at, actually, what is, and then, in terms of, specifically, the Alpha-3 list, the sub-regional names, there are thousands of them, ultimately. And it's understanding that is a very helpful background in order to be able to get your head around these very complicated but important subjects.

The final bullet point, if there's anything else, apart from all of these very lengthy reports, you still should be looking at our reference, the actual 3166 standard.

But I guess it's an open question to this. If we've missed anything out in collecting the preparation resources, then let's get them in and put them on the list, right? And I think there's one minute left. I'll just leave it to Jeff to close, I guess.

Jeff Neuman: You know, I think I've done so much talking. I'm going to leave it to Cheryl to close.

Cheryl Landon-Orr: Oh, I love wrapping things up. This is excellent, like wrapping them up on time, even better. I just want to, on behalf of all the co-leaders here, who - this is their first performance together. You know, there's been no rehearsals. They're getting to know each other and the systems. And I want to thank them on your behalf for doing the job of leading that they have today.

I want to thank you all because you've put some absolutely thought-provoking pieces of information into these pods. So we're going to have a whole lot of fun going over all of these and seeing if we can aggregate some points of a particular concern and some points of greater interest for you all.

I'm also going to ask that you don't make this your one toe in the water in this. You've come and met the folks. You know they are mostly harmless and that they're going to generally play nicely. And we'd like to see you at, most if not, all of the future meetings because this is undoubtedly important thing to try and get right.

We've got to (unintelligible) whatever is said. If you can't get a consensus suggestion unchanged, you're not going to get a change at all. And with that, thanks to the excellent staff, including the tech guys at the back. You just don't get enough warm fuzzies. So can we give them warm fuzzies up the back? Thank you! And this session is heard.

END