

**Transcription ICANN London
Cross-Community WG on the Use of Country & Territory Names as TLDs
Thursday 26 June 2014**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#jun>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Heather Forrest: Good morning everyone. Thank you for joining us in this early meeting here of the cross community working group on the use of country and territory names as TLDs. My name is Heather Forrest. I am a member of the GNSO. I'm a member of the IPC and a co-chair of this group. And I'm pleased to introduce - please, forgive me.

Lisa Fuhr I'm Lisa, Lisa Fuhr from the DK.

Heather Forrest: Who joined me as a co-chair and Ching Chiao, as well, joined as a co-chair, and Paul, can you hear us, Paul Szyndler ?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Heather Forrest: Understood. And Paul, if you can hear us, please, please, please...

Man: As of now, all we have is (Mary) dialed in.

Man: Okay.

Heather Forrest: Thank you. (Paul), when you're able to, please by all means, feel free to interrupt and introduce yourself. And we're supported by very capable Bart Boswinkel. Bart, I'm happy to turn it over to you to set out how we proceed this morning if you'd like.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and maybe - yes. First, the agenda for today I've sent it out to the working group I think late last week. It's, first of all the overview of the deliverables, then developing the work plan and next meetings.

It's quite a loaded - as you will see, it's quite a loaded agenda. So let's - and so first I want to share with you, say, this mind map around the deliverables. This is based - a little bit based on the charter of the working group so that's objective one, two, three and the reporting.

That is also a part of the charter. What I've called process management is something that the working group now needs to decide or not now but need to think of how it wants to conduct its business over the next, say, from now until the Los Angeles meeting.

So we can revisit it again in the Los Angeles meeting. And this is more dependent, say, and that's the nice thing, is depending a little bit on the objective we are talking about.

So moving into the objective itself, according to the charter, the objective one is the review of, in fact, the material of the study group. That's more or less the core of it. So that's a review of the current policies. In the final report of the study group, you will find a list of policies and potential policies because it includes the IDM PDP which is still - which has not been adopted by the board.

There's nothing to do with the board, as for another reason. The second element from the study group of - at the time, is the typology of country and territory names. Again, it's probably a good thing to review that one because that - based on the typology, you will see whether there are issues if you run them through the different policies.

So it's more review whether to see whether - and to check whether the issues identified by the study group at the time, given the changing landscape we're in, are still valid.

And my suggestion would be - and that will give us ample work to do, is to report back to the community so - and to the participating SOs and ACs on the findings because based on these findings, we get into objective number two, the feasibility of the framework.

It's - and that's something that is probably the hardest part of the whole exercise, is - and that will - if we can achieve this in London during the face-to-face meeting or in Los Angeles at the face-to-face meeting, that would be great because this is probably - will need in depth discussion of the issues identified by the study group and whether they - there is a common ground there to resolve them.

And if so, then you have, I think - then you can talk about the feasibility of a framework. And then if there is - if it's feasible, so therefore, a positive answer on it, then we should start working on the feasibility or to develop such a framework.

So that's objective three. Say, whether we reach that one is dependent on objective two. And so we could start with objective one. Part of it - and (Heather) and I were just talking about it, is the reporting. The suggestion is that, say, the co-chairs of this working group will in - say, will prepare a structure for reporting and send it to the working group so we have something to work from as a working group on the reporting itself.

Otherwise we go - yes, we'll have an issue with developing on the fly at the conference call and that's a waste of everybody's time. And so that's a high level overview of, say - I would say the objectives and how they relate to the work plan.

So I don't know, (Heather), whether we want to discuss some of the process management issues and then look into the - furthermore into the objective one, what we expect everybody to do for the next conference call or the other way around first - what we expect, say, the review, et cetera, and then do into what is needed in order to reach the LA meeting with an understanding that we'll be able to report. So it's more up to you.

Heather Forrest: Bart, thank you. I think it makes sense to begin with the process management and with a few questions in terms of our membership just so we can understand. Bart and I have come from the study group and there are a number of new faces in the room and that leads me to think it would be nice to know, do we have a membership list? Do we know how many were constituted up...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, in principle, we have one that we can share. It's on the working group Web page. So, again, and this is the nice thing about having cross community working groups. People from GNSO and at large are very used to working on the Wiki while people from the ccNSO do not use Wikis at all.

So this is a matter of management of all the information sharing. The list of members is available on the Web site of the ccNSO, so the ccNSO.icann.org, and this is where you can see working groups and this working group has its own page.

Heather Forrest: Okay. And thank you, Bart. I think that's important in a sense that one of the things that we try to do - and this should've been perhaps laid out in the beginning, we had had two calls in relation to this prior to London.

One call really dealing with the chairs so that we understood, really, what was happening and how we took this forward from the study group. And one more preparing for London, I suppose.

And I suppose the preparing for London also included a summary of the study group report. And I think - I really can't - I can't emphasize this point more, really. It's imperative that working group members read the study group report.

The study group was faced with significant challenge in terms of we were a diverse group. We came with no set outcome, so to speak. We were not asked a leading question. We were - the mandate was quite clear but also quite open - go out and find current policy affecting country and territory names, of course as a first step.

And this is the typology that Bart refers to, the first step is to determine what is a country name. And I can assure you there was significant discussion around what a country name is and Bart, my question, then, in terms of this objective, one, review the typology.

I would like to draw a line under the word review and say this is review. We really are not in a position to rewrite. It's not within our scope to rewrite the topology. Can you confirm that?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, that's my understanding as well but, yes, a bit of flexibility is what do you do if you review it and you find some holes and loopholes? It's - but it's, in principle, and that was in the mandate of this working group, the study group report is the, say, the starting point for the further discussion.

But in order to ensure that it is the correct - because some time has passed since then, we need to check whether everything is still up to date. That's how I would qualify in a review.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Bart. With that in mind, I should pose - I suppose it does make sense, if you agree, to continue in the discussion of process management. I think one of the things that the co-chairs have discussed up to now is we would like to have a very clear plan as to how we go about progressing.

Let's say that this isn't done on an ad hoc basis but it's not, you know, a week before LA, we all realize we haven't done anything and/or we've had a few ad hoc phone calls.

We have now, and I meant to pull up the calendar here, we're the 26th of June. We've got until mid-October which tells me we have, like, July, August, September. We have 3-1/2 months roughly to get work done. That suggests to me that we might be able to get away with perhaps every - a monthly call and/or three weeks maybe at the end if we need it, just an additional one before LA. Do you agree, Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and as we have some ccTLDs from the Northern Hemisphere, I would say July and August is going to be very hard. Maybe - but that's a matter of sending out (dula) poles at the, I would say, end of July - I would say mid-July until mid-August is - these are really dead months in the Northern Hemisphere, at least in Europe.

So starting today, that would mean either we have a first call reviewing the current policies before the mid-July break and then revisit the typology somewhere end of August.

And then by, I would say, the - yes, somewhere in September, and mid-September, a first call on the reporting, and then the - by the early week, first week of October, a final call on the reporting, so that's available for the community on, say, I believe the conclusions from this final - from the study group are supported by the working group itself as well or where that needs a little bit of tweaking.

And then I think - and then we - as - and then we are very much in line with, say, what we just discussed, that the Los Angeles meeting is a very good opportunity to start thinking about the feasibility of a framework and initiate that discussion at the face-to-face meeting.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Okay. (Paul), go ahead.

Paul Szyndler : I just wish - for my apologies for the difficulty that I had calling into this. I am hearing my own voice in the background which is a delight but, look, I agree with everything so far. I think the point that I would (stress) is the need for what had been said about developing a work plan that's consistent, that we know we can expect.

It's predictable. I'm sorry, I'm distracted again by own voice in the background but having something that can be established and something that we can work toward the next few months. I acknowledge Bart's pointing out the July and August being a (lost) month in Europe but I believe that setting up a framework would probably be something we can reasonably achieve before Los Angeles.

Bart Boswinkel: Setting up the framework itself, you mean, (Paul). Or you mean the framework for a work plan.

Paul Szyndler The framework for the work plan, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, okay. You're welcome.

Paul Szyndler : Unless you'd like to (unintelligible) now in which case, (that's fine).

Bart Boswinkel: The non-dictatorship, it's called, I believe. No, I fully agree but having this the way we looked at it, so right now is - it means that the first job really is starting with the review of the current policies and that's the homework for everybody on this working group to start really be looking at the final report of the study group itself.

So at the first call, there will be, say, a discussion. We need a discussion around the review of the current policies. And it's - if I recall the - say, the study group trying to map or trying to include all policies relating to TLDs, the only thing is whether the latest is the first check and then we need to quickly run through whether the summary of these policies because they're very extensive, is still applicable as well.

Once we've done that, I think we can sign off on the first one. And this is more a matter of homework of the working group members than anything else. But - so what I could do as support staff, is put this in as a first deliverable of the working group that by the end of the first call we have, say, by mid-July, that everybody has reviewed it and then we check it and then that is done.

And, say, subsequently for the typology, because that's more difficult and - the typology and the issues identified, I would say, somewhere by the end of August.

And then that running through deck again gives you ample time. We will send out reminders that you have to do it, et cetera. And then I think in this manner, we have a nice way forward. In the meantime, say, the co-chairs could think through and have a discussion about - and propose a way of reporting the findings on these two objectives to the community and to the participating SOs.

And it doesn't need to be a full report of - it could be just fairly simple, two or three pager. Say we've done this, we've done this. And these are the findings to date and reaffirming all, et cetera, the documentation from the study group.

Paul Szyndler : Bart, if I may - (Paul) here again.

Bart Boswinkel: Go ahead, (Paul).

Paul Szyndler : I just wanted to reiterate what (Bob did) there and I apologize because there are certain members of this working group that have been part of the study group previously and they heard me describe the outcome and the deliverables and the findings of the study group on many occasions.

If there is a need, I'm very happy to, on a subsequent call, to work through all of that again. So should people read through the final report, if they have questions about the reason in the process, whatever we went through to achieve the final report, I'd be happy to brief on that again.

Bart Boswinkel: (Paul), may I make another suggestion? Is we got an email list of this working group and we can use it as an archive. If people say, knowing what will happen for the next call, and starting to work on it, if they have any questions relating to, say, at least as the first part of objective one, the current policies or have some additional comments, et cetera, that they will send it to the email list and then we use that opportunity on the first call to go through it.

And so I'll keep an archive of all these questions and a week before that call, so that's already in two weeks, by the way, something. So over the next two weeks, you send questions, if any, to the working group list and then based on that one, we have more of - it - we can use that to discuss them and check in the final report itself whether it's a matter of interpretation or difference in interpretation or that we need to readjust something. What do you think of that (unintelligible).

Paul Szyndler : You just made my life easier, Bart. I can't help but agree.

Bart Boswinkel: So it's time that we change (unintelligible) otherwise we say, at the last meetings or the first meeting in Singapore, you did the presentation as well, the presentations are available from the past on the Web site of - or the Web page of the study group itself.

So - and that's on the formal working groups on the ICANN Web s- on the ccNSO Web site. So if people really want to understand and have a different perspective on how it's written, they can go back to the study group material.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. Just a quick question, Bart, and I confess, I haven't looked - do we have the - I suspect we don't have the draft on the - so we did have a draft report and then we had a final report. And there were a few changes and I'm thinking specifically, (Pau), you and I had some discussion around a few points, some of which went into the report and some of which didn't.

There was a bit of tweaking of the draft and that goes some way to explaining the thinking process, like today, and some of the issues because I do think, (Paul), I agree 100% with Bart that it's not the time to have you chart out your summary again.

I think the understanding should be if you're on the working group, that you work through that study group report yourself, but what isn't necessarily captured in the final report isn't necessarily some of the discussion around issues, some of the things where we did have some robust discussion of what transcripts did we have. I don't - I'm not suggesting that everyone bore themselves by reading all of the transcripts but perhaps the transcript on the final report.

Bart Boswinkel: Let me have the - oh, somebody dropped off. Let me check and tell you in a minute - who we have on the - okay, excuse me. We have a progress report, so the only document that posted, the presentations are there, one of the presentations.

There are transcripts of all the meetings of this working group, so starting from the conference call on the 11th of May 2011 until the 11th of April 2013. The document available on the final report and the progress report and I can dig up...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Bart Boswinkel: Is it? Okay, then even better. Yes, draft final report. Yes. And there is a public comment forum as well, yes. Yes. The basic material is available on the - what I'll do is - and that is for your convenience. I will send you a link to the Web page of the study group itself. That makes it easier if you're not familiar with the ccNSO Web site.

Heather Forrest: Quick question, Bart, and this is - I'm not at all trying to bang any sort of drum here. We are a cross community working group and, yet, we're on the ccNSO Web page. Is that standard practice or is that - are we just carrying over because of the study group of ccNSO or...

Bart Boswinkel: It's more or less - it is a big of a standard practice.

Heather Forrest: Okay.

Barb Boswinkel: The reason is, say, again, the CC members, as I said, are very used to using the Web pages and not used to using the Wikis. This working group has a Wiki. But that's maintained by the GNSO staff.

In order - and the reason why we put it on - if you would look for the other cross community working group on the - the cross community working group square, I think is now the abbreviation, that has its own Web page on the ccNSO side as well. But the Wiki is run by the GNSO staff. So this is more - it's easier for staff support to do it this way. Let me rephrase that.

Maybe it's a good idea that, at the end of this meeting, so as soon as possible, I will write up, say, make this objective when I put a bit of a timeline around it so everybody knows when and what is expected and we'll send out a (doodle) pole early next week when everybody's back home for the first call and probably for the second call as well, by the end of August.

Heather Forrest: Yes, and can I follow up with that and say I'm very conscience that we want to progress this. It's a difficult issue. It's challenging. But we do want to make progress and I would feel quite disappointed and sorry to be assisting as a chair. It's sort of not on my watch, that we just sort of kick the can down the road and don't do anything.

I would like to have maybe on the record and agree today that we try and achieve objective one before or by LA, I suppose. That we're in a position to start doing the substantive work, so to speak, with objective two come LA.

I think that's - it's achievable. I think the study group report is very well-written, much thanks to (Paul). It captures quite a bit of the dialogue and the discussion that we had within the study group and the differing views to the extent that those arose, and the challenges that the study group faced in reaching decisions, particularly around the typology.

But I do think that that's achievable and I think in terms of the reporting, just to clarify again, that the co-chairs, the four co-chairs will discuss and have locked down by LA, an understanding of how we'll do the reporting, how, when, how frequently and this sort of thing so that we go forward from LA with a clear plan as to what we're doing.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and I would say, even suggest (unintelligible) would do this, say, maybe present this to the working group by the end of August because it already is a reporting on objective one. That needs to be done anyway.

And that should be feasible to do by - for the Los Angeles one - objective one, the review, should be completed by Los Angeles. That's my thinking and so the reporting is more on - and the discussion among the co-chairs and presenting this to the working group members, is probably - is due - and maybe that's a good thing and to pick up in the work plan as well, is due by the end of August.

So that gives us some time to - one or two calls as co-chairs in preparation of the meeting, how we want to progress on the reporting and propose it to the working group members. I'll - if everybody's agreeing with this, I'll include it as such in the - say, in the work plan itself.

Heather Forrest: May I also make a personal (entreaty). I'm looking at the working group member list and it's very clear that we have a small fraction of working group members in the room today and only two people on the phone.

This is something - this is a problem that arose in the study group. I think we need to go home and encourage our colleagues to attend the meeting. This is an issue that is fraught with all sorts of angst.

And I do not want to get to the end and people say, "Hey, wait a minute. How did you get to that conclusion? And let's dig it apart. And let's pull it apart and I didn't have my say." This is a cross community working group. There was no restriction on who could attend the meeting, who could join the group, none that I'm aware of.

We need participation. We cannot get to the end of this difficult road and have folks hold up their hand and say, "I don't know how we got here. I - we need to do this over again. We don't like the conclusion," this that and the other. So please go back to your SO and AC and drag your colleagues along. I think this is an important thing.

Bert Boswinkel: Yes, Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Annebeth Lange, dotNO. One of the things that was said in the other group I'm attending - the cross community for the new framework for working together, was exactly that, that you should, in a way, also confirm your non-participation, so if you go in, you will try to do whatever you can and you can't come afterwards and say that I didn't know.

So I think that's just a very valid point. So if you don't participate, it's your own fault and you can't come afterwards and say that, "Oh, I didn't know." So Bart, I think that you should really, when you send out this, really encourage people to do the utmost to, if they can't participate in a conference because that can often be a tactical thing. At least they can send something, read the transcript, send in their comments afterwards and do what they can to be enlightened.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes and just for your colleagues I know there are competing working groups and as you just noted this is a bit of a (unintelligible) the hour after the (unintelligible) so.

Great (show) - what are those are (shows) that say and this is more for say our - the staff is that we need to find an alternative time. And I know there is one major competing working group at least from ccNSO that's a joint working group as well starting at 9:00.

And normally we would try to do - to be on Sunday but then you have the GNSO days. So it's a bit of trade off and for the CEC so you understand a bit of the - that's one of the - yes unfortunate things of cross (unintelligible) working group especially this one with (unintelligible) as well.

Is ccNSO has its full meeting days on Tuesday and Wednesday so there are two days. Where Monday is a bit tricky because you got the opening ceremony and the (re-stack) day and a lot of people from the cc side do want to attend that day.

So that these effectively only Sunday, which is again a bit of a hassle for the GNSO and Thursday.

Heather Dryden: Bart could I propose perhaps Sunday we did end in the GNSO relatively early on a Sunday and split up into working groups and this sort of thing. Perhaps Sunday afternoon would be helpful.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes and I think...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: ...where is it?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Bart Boswinkel: ...we have - okay can you read the question Kristina?

Man: Do we have any numbers at all, how many people are registered for this group, how many people sent apologies, how many didn't send apologies but still didn't show up?

Bart Boswinkel: How many people we've got, we got 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 we've got 15 people - this is the wrong one. As far as I know say we got four and Mary sent before and I haven't seen any other apologies on the email list itself nor have I received one for this one.
I don't know on record that was...

Woman: We're roughly 38.

Bart Boswinkel: We're roughly 38.

Man: I'm sorry.

Bart Boswinkel: Three eight.

Man: Thirty-eight members.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Man: And how many do we have here?

Bart Boswinkel: You can count as fast as I can.

Man: Twenty maybe?

Bart Boswinkel: Twenty, no - I think fifteen.

Man: Twelve.

Bart Boswinkel: And 10 signed up plus two or three on the call yes.

Heather Dryden: And I see that it's only one person from the GAC and this is actually a very important thing for the GAC.

Man: Yes.

Heather Dryden: So we must avoid that they are not participating and then afterwards we will have problems. So I think we should try to say to them to please send some more people at least one or two that's active participants.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes I fully agree but I wonder whether it's - so we've invited them two or three times as a GAC. We wanted to have it on the GAC agenda but there was no interest say from the GAC members in that sense.

At least we have one and I think you all have personal contacts to GAC members and use that as an alternative means. (Unintelligible) it doesn't imply that they supported or whatsoever but at least we need to have the government views in the discussion as well.

That's far more important, then, because the end report is the end report of the working group and not one of the SO's in AC it has to go back to the SO's and AC's. So that's the protection.

If you can engage with a GAC member or who you think is interested and even as an observer want to attend these meetings. That's probably an easier way than sending out a letter again to the GAC because that will not work.

Heather Dryden: The question is, is the reviews concrete deliverable for end of August a collation but the chairs of working group members comments on apologies and topology or something else?

And as a follow up comment clarity will lead to more effective outcomes. Let me read the question again. Is the reviews concrete deliverable for end of August a collation by the chairs of working group members comments on apologies and topology or something else?

If I can try and pass I'll take a stab at answering the question. I think I'm not - I would say tentatively no if I understand the question correctly. What we are trying to do for end of August is that the chairs will propose the framework for reporting.

How SO's and AC's go back and feed into - how we feedback information to the SO's and AC's and how that information comes back to this working group. Good I have a co-chair nodding that's good.

But this group in terms of review this group all members the task for all members is to by mid-July review the study groups report, which is on the link that Bart has or that has been posted here, staff has posted here.

Review the report if you have questions raise questions on the list. If you're not sure how the study group came to a particular view, if you have questions around why the study group came to a particular view, how a particular conclusion was reached.

Review that report, the report really is in two substantive parts I mean there's a contextual background that is very important to understand but there's this topology, which is the notion of what is a geographic name or excuse me what is a - wow that is a much bigger question.

What is a country and territory name, have an understanding of that. We can canvas so that was the question that I raised to Bart at the start of the meeting to the extent that you have questions or concerns around the topology.

And then this notion of current policy, that was the working group or the study groups objective, that was the mandate was identify current policy not analyze not discuss, not pick apart but simply identify.

So the study group is very much a framework a platform for this group I suppose and we need to make sure that that list of policy is up to date before we progress.

So two things then one, topology do you understand it, do you have questions about it, are there holes are there gaps we can discuss that. Two, what are the current policies do we need to bring anything up to date.

We're not too far from when the study group finished but it would be good to have that - it needs to be an item in the agenda that we've discussed that and we know and we've moved on.

We know we don't have any board signed off policy since then but we need to have that clear in everyone's mind.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes and I think say for the July call because it's so close review the list of current policies so that is part of reading it so we can sign off on that topic say we reviewed as a working group the current list of current policies it's still valid.

And that's the first checked and the first deliverable or sub-deliverable of this working group. And then we go into the topology, review it and that's for the end of August and do that as a check off and then we report say, we reviewed it we've understood it and then we go into the face-to-face meeting.

Heather Dryden: Yes. If anyone has questions I think now is a good time to ask. I don't have anything else to say from my position, good we have another question.

(Alvi): Good morning my name is (Alvi) I am not part of this group but I am (unintelligible) a member from Africa. And when I saw this topic on our agenda I think it is very interesting because with the new gTLD program people from countries in Africa they started asking can we have our country name as a TLD.

So I know that the answer is definitely currently now is no so I have just two questions. Is this report from the study group available for the public? If yes is it available in other languages because in Africa we are dealing with some (unintelligible) people?

Just a question because I think (unintelligible) ICANN document that required long-term like maybe more towards a year comment feedback from people maybe that report can be in some other languages until this report can be available or the comment period is required like a year or many months so you can get many (positions).

So my second question is can an individual from the community (unintelligible) send feedback because under studies across community working group many SO's, AC's but if you have people in general from the ICANN community is there a way at least for them to send feedback to the working group?

And then the last question also I don't know if there is an answer from the study group now regarding timeframe when country names can be TLD if

there is something from the study group because or if they have to wait for a (unintelligible) thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Let's start with the last. Yes the last one is an interesting one because as a result of the study group they had two recommendations the study group. One was to create this cross community working group.

And the second recommendation was to send a letter to the ICANN board to extend the common rule. It hasn't happened yet because we want to have the working group up and running but to extend the common rule under the African guidebook that all country and territory names are excluded as TLDs or new gTLDs.

It hasn't happened but they are excluded at least for the first round.

Heather Dryden: Yes and the discussion to be clear the discussion within the study group was that until further issues were resolved it was really pending the study group. But the study group needed to convene and then it would be charged with revisiting this issue.

So it was really just a holding pattern. I wouldn't like to say let's say your question and to give my analytical approach to it presumes that at some point country and territory names will be available.

I think we need to be very clear we go into this study group without a predetermined outcome. We're here to discuss this and that's one of the questions granted the main question that will be considered by the study group.

Bart Boswinkel: Going back to the availability of the material the report of the study group is online so it's not translated but if need be and that's how - one of the reasons why it's not translated is although it's a - in principle ccTLD report, ccTLD

report we found that some of the translation tools available give a reasonable idea of the content.

And I don't know whether it's you need to do - or whether it is feasible with PDF otherwise I can said you a Word version of the document and that's - and that is machine translatable.

And that should help you have - just give you a broad idea of the content and that's what people most of the time need they don't need the next - because this is just advice and nothing else.

(Alvi): Let me have - let me raise a question. On the right side we see following this (co-part) of the working group is limited to first point or second point. They use our country and territory names as top level domains.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

(Alvi): Can you describe more what it means? So the scope is limited to use the country and territory names as top level domains so.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes to make it very clear this working group will not go into the question for example that's under discussion right now can a two letter code so that's in principle all letter codes on the ISO3166 be used as second level, that's outsided scope.

We're only talking about top level domains we're not talking about second level domains or third level domains only top level domains only what is in the (remit) of ICANN.

(Alvi): The second sentence only means that...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Find a word only - any other questions? So to recap there will be (unintelligible) mid-July and end of August that's the first one. You are

expected to read the study groups final report focusing on the current policies and check whether they in your opinion are still valid yes or no.

And the good thing is that we do have people from the GNSO and the ccNSO that because these are the valid policies. If there are any questions related to the review of the current policies please post them online and they should be doable by mid-July because not very much has changed since that time but it is now up to the working group to do this.

If everybody is comfortable with it we can sign off on it. The co-chairs will start thinking and preparing a structure for reporting that will be up for discussion by the end of August so - and shared with you and I think that's about it, yes.

Heather Dryden: One last question we talked about that letter that we present to ICANN...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Heather Dryden: ...about the final report and will you do that, the co-chairs do that and when...

Bart Boswinkel: No, this has nothing to do with this working group this is something to do from the ccNSO council.

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: This has nothing to do with this working group that is one of the recommendations of the study group the council adopted but we needed to have this working group up and running before we could send out that letter otherwise it would be - yes.

Any other questions? Does anybody raise his hand in the Adobe? Okay if not then - hello Mary.

Mary Wong: Hello, this is Mary, yes absolutely...

Bart Boswinkel: Hi Mary.

Mary Wong: ...yes thank you absolutely conversation I think you should mention before that in some way we said that we need to encourage our members to attending the meeting and if it is possible to do reconfirmation that people - the people are really ready and have this time and opportunity to attend this meeting as soon as (unintelligible) then we should also encourage them.

And also to encourage (unintelligible) members I think it will further our relationship with (unintelligible).

Bart Boswinkel: Good, yes, we do and I will not repeat what Mary said but I think we all agreed to do it is a rule of this - internal rule working of this working group.

Man: And you wanted to answer.

Heather Dryden: Very happy to close the meeting thank you very much Bart we benefit tremendously from your support. This is not let's acknowledge like support this is very devoted and knowledgeable support so I'm very, very grateful for that.

We all are Bart so thank you very much. If there - I assume there are no further questions not seeing any, thank you very much again may I reiterate please make sure go back to your SO's and AC's and make sure that we have attendance in this, yes. Thank you very much.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thank you Heather thank you Bart.

Man: Bye Paul; bye Mary.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Bye.

Woman: Hello, hello (unintelligible).

END