

---

SINGAPORE -  
9 February , 2015 – 12:15 to 13:45 SGT  
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

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

Heather Forrest: Good afternoon, everyone. This is the meeting of the Cross Constituency -- or Cross Community, in fact, Working Group, on Country and Territory names as Top-Level Domains. May I ask, please, that the recording be started. Thanks.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Heather Forrest: Thank you very much. And may I, given that we have plenty of room at the table, may I invite everyone to come join us at the table, please, so you are closer to a microphone, and can participate. We are happy to -- actually delighted to have you here. Marvelous; no one follows instructions. So, wonderful -- it's a wonderful start.

May we begin, please by, we have new faces in the room and that's wonderful. I would appreciate if we could begin with a quick introduction, who you are and whether you are a member of the -- of the CWG, and that's not to call anyone out, if you are not, we are very much welcome observers and participants. And I'll be happy to begin. My name is Heather Forrest, I'm a Co-Chair of the CWG, and a member of the GNSO.

Annabeth Lange: Good morning, everyone. I'm Annabeth Lange, from the ccNSO Constituency, and also a Co-Chair of the Group.

Lars Hoffmann: I'm Lars Hoffmann, I'm ICANN Staff. I'm not good with microphones, and I'm supporting this group.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

- Maxim Alzoba: I'm Maxim Alzoba, FAITID, NTAG, right here.
- Jorge Pérez: Jorge Pérez; (inaudible) ccNSO, and late member of this Group.
- Daniel Kalchev: Daniel Kalchev, the ccNSO, too.
- Mahima Kaul: Mahima Kaul, from the Observer Research Foundation, India. And I've come to observe.
- Unidentified Participant: Yoko Plakat (ph), from (Inaudible), the Dot.EU Registry.
- Patrick Jones: Patrick Jones from ICANN Staff, and also liaison from ICANN to the U.N. Group of Experts on Geographic Names.
- David McAuley: David McAuley, with Verisign. I'm not part of the Group.
- Ernest: And my name is Ernest Storm (ph). I'm from Norway in the GAC. Myself, I'm not a part of the Group, but I (inaudible/audio skip). Thank you.
- Nora Hutchinson: Nora Hutchinson, from Nominet Registry, for Dot.UK part of the Group.
- Jaap Akkerhuis: Jaap Akkerhuis, from NLnet Labs. And I'm actually the -- I (inaudible) around 66 Expert to this Group.
- Bart Bostwinkel: Bart Boswinkel, ccNSO Support Staff.



- Ron Sherwood: Ron Sherwood, Dot.BI, ccNSO Liaison to ALAC, and a member of this Group.
- Gabriella Schittek: Gabriella Schittek, ccNSO Secretarial. Can I also just say that we are supposed to have Miriana Tochic, joining us on the phone, but she's not with us yet. So I'll let you know.
- Paul Szyndler: Paul Szyndler, from Dot.AU, ccNSO, and one of the Co-Chairs of this Group.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Where am I from? Good question. I know I'm part of this Group, I'm the ALAC Liaison to the GNSO, and then prior relationship of course is with the working party and Study Group involved in this topic as well.
- Carlos Gutierrez: Thank you. Carlos Gutierrez, I'm a Member of the GNSO Council for the NomCom, and Co-Chair of this Group. Thank you.
- Heather Forrest: Thank you very much.
- Van Bentley: Hi. Van Bentley from Amazon. Just observing.
- Lewis: (Inaudible) Lewis, from SIDN. Just observing.
- Jugo De Limon: Jugo De Limon, SIDN. Also an observer.
- Unidentified Participant: Hi. My name is Tishu (ph) from Japan. I'm (inaudible) Association, also to the Character Registry.



Jane: Jane Joyce (ph), from Deloitte. Just observing.

Michelle Scott-Tucker: Michelle Scott-Tucker, AC GAC Secretariat, as an observer.

Tracey Hind: Tracey Hind, AC GAC Secretariat, as an observer.

Unidentified Participant: You don't get away with that?

Julia Charvolen: Julia Charvolen; GAC Support Staff.

Unidentified Participant: Hossein Shahim (ph) , GAC Support Staff.

Unidentified Participant: I'm a Director, from the (inaudible) Registry, Dot-Africa.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather Forrest. Thank you, all, very much for being here, and a particularly warm welcome to those who are joining us for the first time. My Co-Chairs have asked me to chair meeting, I'll do that up until around 1:30, at which point, I'll transition, with Annabeth's good graces, over to Annabeth.

Our agenda, we have an agenda, it's a relatively short one, that begins with the review of the options paper that you see on the screen in front of you, and what we'll do, I suspect we have enough, yeah, I suspect we have enough for everyone.



I'd like to -- before we go into this topic in a substantive manner, say, a bit of what we've done since ICANN in L.A. We've had a rather productive period despite the holidays, and that's really all thanks to the hard work of our support staff, in particular, Lars and Bart, who have kept us on track, and make sure that we had something substantive to do at this meeting.

I suppose one of the very big challenges to what this CWG is facing, is the enormity of the task. This is really the primary conclusion of the Study Group, what a big task we have ahead of us to determine whether or not it's feasible to develop a consistent, clear, coherent, predictable framework, in relation to the use of country and territory names, determine whether that's possible, and then make recommendations to the extent that it is possible.

And we haven't dealt with substance up to now because we've largely been grappling with procedural issues, and I'm hopeful that today will be our last, if you like, procedural meeting, and we'll move into substance, from this point forward.

What you have in front of you on the screen, and in document form, is a strawman proposal that is meant to commence our substantive discussion. Our Charter, which is a product of the Study Group, on country and territory names, charges us with two primary tasks, one -- and interrelated. One is, determine; is it possible to develop a framework for how country and territory names might be treated at the top level. And two, make recommendations as to what that framework might look like.

It's important at this point to emphasize that our work is strictly limited by the scope of our Charter, which was strictly by what had been undertaken at the level of the Study Group. Given the enormity of this task, and the issues that we are faced in developing New gTLD policy for the Applicant Guidebook, this group and a previous group were constrained to the ISO-3166 list. The ISO 3166 list has, if you like, three manifestations, and this Group's work can be then divided into three work streams. And I think they are consecutive work streams rather than simultaneous work streams for a variety of reasons.



What we have is two-letter country codes, as set out in ISO-3166-1, the two, the alpha-two-letter codes, alpha three-letter codes, and then the names of the countries and territories in the ISO list. What we have put down onto paper, if you like, is a path forward for how we discuss these things, and you'll see that what we have, what we've summarized to start off with in each one of these categories, is the status quo, meaning the status quo of ICANN policy in respect of these things. Looking at gTLDs and ccTLDs. This is largely the work that we've done up to now in this group; which is really confirming the work that had been done by the Study Group, and set out in a great deal of detail in the Study Group's Final Report.

And one of our first tasks in this Group was to say, has anything changed since the Study Group Report was published? And we came to the answer that really nothing substantive, in terms of policy, had changed, that the implementation of New gTLD had of course brought up anomalies, and certain instances in how names were classified, as falling into module 2.2.1.4 of the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook, but that the policy itself had not changed.

So with that in mind we've set out the status quo, followed by, out of the status quo; what are the issues? What are the issues that the Study Group raised? What are the issues that we could immediately think up off the top of our head, in terms developing, again, aiming to the point of the Study Group, and what we are mandated to do under the Charter. What are the challenges to developing a consistent framework in relation to the use of these particular strings?

And you'll see that -- we see that the list, again, this is a strawman, this is not at all, in any way -- I have to make this crystal clear, this is a starting point for our discussions. We've seeded some ideas here. What are the challenges? We'll have discussions about what more challenges exist, and then finally, possible options, bearing in mind the status quo, bearing in mind the issues, what options does ICANN have, what options does the community have, for how these things might be treated.

As an overarching policy, relating not just to (inaudible) but to country codes as well. So, as you flip through -- as you flip through the documents, I suppose -- as I say, this is really our, I hope final, mainly procedural meeting in a sense. What I would like to do discuss the concept of this framework as a path forward. We don't have a great deal of scope to expand the number of



categories of things that we are looking at, so beyond the two-letter, three-letter and full names, because that really is our charter. This is what we have been tasked with doing. It's really the approach as to how we go about doing that, and as you can imagine, given the complexity of the issue, it's been difficult to reach this point even in determining how, procedurally, we go about doing things.

I'll say a bit, before I open the floor, about why I believe these things ought to be addressed sequentially. Two-letter country codes, there is existing policy on this, and some background to this, and one of the things -- in fact, one of the things that's missing from this document, is the justifications -- Oh, no. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. It's a dot-point that we fold into the (inaudible/audio skip).

One thing that will need to be considered for each one of these three categories is, why. And it's a question that the Study Group did not take up, it wasn't part of the Study Group's mandate. I think in order to determine whether a policy framework is possible going forward, we obviously need to explore why, and in relation to each of the options we put forward; what are the benefits and burdens of each of those forms of frameworks?

In relation to other codes there's a greater depth of background as to what -- as to why those were restricted within the New gTLD round, there's a great deal of history that goes back with that, and I believe this is a good starting point, in that the ISO 3166 list is quite clear. We have no question as to what these two-letter codes are, we have a background as to why they've been, if you like, a part in previous policy on both generic and country code top-level domains. Three-letter codes, slightly more challenging but not greatly so.

And then finally the full names or short-form, long and short-form names of the entities on this list, and I believe, based on the work of the Study Group, that that will be our greatest challenge, and I think if we are able to deal sequentially with these things, we'll learn some lessons about our own methodology, and our own thinking, about how we approach these, and in identifying challenges in relation to two and three-letter codes, I think that will help us to identify challenges and issues in relation to long and short-form names. So, hence my proposal is, and it's not --



certainly not something that has been agreed or even discussed in great detail amongst Co-Chairs, is that we try and deal with these things, sequentially.

With that, I'd like to open the floor, if anyone has any questions about how this came about, what it looks like, the information that's here, and what's being proposed, please, by all means raise them.

And this is Heather Forrest. I'll add as well, if any of my Co-Chairs would like to offer input. Paul, I'm looking at you from the background of the Study Group, if there's anything, having chaired the Study Group, that you feel would be helpful here, then that would be wonderful.

Paul Szyndler:

Thank you, Heather. It's Paul Szyndler here for the record. There's probably little that I could add right now, because I don't want it to sound like the Co-Chairs are mutually slapping each other's back saying; job well done so far. But what I'd like to note for the participants who either only, tangentially, participated in the Study Group, or are new to this process, or to our discussions a part of the Working Group, is that generally, we tend to work fairly -- it's (a) collegiately; it's (b) based on the strawman models, where, if you start reading through some of the examples and options that we have listed, they might maybe tend to be extremely contentious to you and your community to start with, as long as everybody comes into these meetings acknowledging that it is just a strawman, these ideas are put down, they are simply to stimulate thought and discussion.

It's a lot easier for someone to put up their hand, we've found, and say; no, I don't like this, rather than to force them to come up with a concept themselves, and advocate what they do like. So, there are things, even in this very early iteration of the strawman, that please, don't assume that the Co-Chairs in any way endorse that, it's just to facilitate conversation. It reflects closely, the approach of the Study Group took. I'll say, as Chair of that, I thought it worked relatively well. So that's why we've adopted the process going forward. However, we do have a tendency to rely on what we've done before. So again, I'd reiterate what Heather said, we welcome views from newcomers as to otherwise, they'd like to approach this process.





And at the risk of monopolizing the microphone, I'll wrap it now, but chip in later on.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Paul. Would anyone like to raise comments, concerns, sharpen your sticks? Does this appear to be a logical approach, for going forward? The methodical one, wherein we look at each category. Sheryl, you are nodding your head, so I'm going to pick on you. Yes?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Inaudible)

Heather Forrest: All right, yes. General agreement for the process? What we are missing in this document, and what I'd like to do, this is really a draft, you see a few notes in the margin, is we'll tidy this up, and we'll circulate to the list. There's two pages that sit in front of this that have a bit of background, why we put this paper together, we've made that explanation orally today, but for the record, we'll post the whole paper on the list. Anyone who is not a member of our Group who would like to see that document, I don't see any reason why, in large part, why we couldn't put it onto our webpage, and that will make it available to the public.

The webpage is very easy to find. It sits, for absolute clarity I'm mindful of my friends in the ccNSO, it does sit in the ccNSO breadcrumb trail, if you like, our group, and that's really just a historical convenience arising from the fact that the Study Group was initially called by the ccNSO, and rather than develop a whole new page on the GNSO site, we've left things parked there. So to the extent that you look for ccNSO country and territory names, you will find us and our current work.

Excellent! With that in mind, I suppose, as a procedural point, it's not normally something we do in this group, but given the interest of the community here, what I would propose that we do is, perhaps, have a motion to approve this as a path forward, and a seconder; and we record that in the minutes of the meeting, if we are willing.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Inaudible) .

Paul Szyndler: (Inaudible).

Heather Forrest: Yeah. So moved by Sheryl, or Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and seconded by Paul. Thank you very much. All right. With that, in mind, our second item on the agenda is, potential for cooperation with the GAC Working Group on the protection of geographic names.

The Co-Chairs drafted, I suppose this is again, an update of what happened since L.A. The Co-Chairs drafted, again, a strawman to start that process through the group, in the course of meetings in December and -- I guess, November and December, because the letter was posted at the end of December. Participating in the comments, process that was enlivened by the publication of a proposal within what was then a sub-group of the GAC, and is now, I understand a working group within the GAC.

And our primary comment, if you like, the thrust of the comments that we submitted, were that it procedurally seemed rather difficult and illogical to have two parallel work streams, overlapping a particular issue. And it's important to emphasize at this stage that as we said with the framework that you see in front of you, or the roadmap for developing the framework, our scope in this group is strictly limited. It's strictly limited to country and territory names as set out in ISO 3166-1, the proposal upon which we were commenting is of course, much broader than that, and our chief concern articulated in that letter, was the existence of two parallel work streams, covering ISO 3166-1.

And I suppose it would be helpful at this stage I know, that we are joined by Olga Cavalli, and Olga, you've missed or around-the-table introduction, so I'll ask you to do that. I'm aware that we have a session on Wednesday in the schedule, and we don't have the benefit of knowing what will happen at that session, but I would appreciate if you could provide us with a very short synopsis of the comments that were received, whether our comment has been taken into consideration, and what happens next. Thank you.



Olga Cavalli:

Thank you, Heather. Thank you, for the invitation, and first, apologies for not being so active in the Group. I'm a member of the Group, but honestly, there's so much going on, and all this process that it has been difficult for me to join the calls, but I follow the list.

Thank you, for the comments that you sent to our document. I think that you said something very interesting. That you said that the -- and about the overlapping thing, I think it's our vision, it's the -- both groups are totally complementary, because if you focus on those names that are in the list, and you just mentioned that (inaudible/audio skip) out of that, are strictly limited to the ISO (inaudible/audio skip), and what we are trying to do is an exercise as to what would happen. How can we lower uncertainty for the applicant, for the countries, for the community of those names that are not in the list.

So the point is a different perspective, it's totally a complement of the work that you do. So, we don't see it as a competition, we see it as Group that can be enhanced in between the Group and the GAC, which is now a Working Group, and the Group that you Co-Chair, with the other Co-Chairs. So that's the first comment.

All the information about the comments received, a summary of all the comments received; prepare a first draft by our Secretariat. Michelle, thank you so much for that. She's great. And reviewed by the Working Group, it's online, also the structure of the session, it's online, it's on the GAC website, so I can send you the link later today, but it's there. It's one hour. I will do a brief introduction of the different types of comments that we received, which I will explain now. And then we will have five speakers, very short time for each of them, trying to explain what their contributions were. We have (inaudible) you suggested yesterday during the cocktail (inaudible/audio skip), so it's included. Thank you for that suggestion.

We haven't had the confirmation from them so far, but we hope that we have it. We will have a remote participant from Africa, we will have the GNSO, the ccNSO, the ALAC, and I'm missing one, it will come. I have a horrible jet lag, so I'm sorry for that. And then we will have interaction with the audience, like 20 minutes, hopefully, 15, and some remarks. What the Working Group



didn't have time to do, was to prepare a new version of the background document. So we are reviewing the background document, we are reviewing the comments, and with the input from the audience; from the comments, and from all the things that we talk in the session, and ones that we will work in a new version, hopefully, to be reviewed by the Buenos Aires Meeting.

Which comments we received? We received like almost 26 comments, they are all online, comment period was extended until the 31<sup>st</sup> of December, as requested by several organizations, and the community. We've heard it was okay. We translated the background document into several languages, which is online. So we received three types of comments. Part of the comments say, no; just we don't like it, reject. And no proposal.

Some of the comments said; we don't like it, but we may engage in further dialogue. We think there are some things that we can work upon from here. And some comments say; we have some ideas on how to move forward. We can make a proposal on how to build up from there lower uncertainties, work on the scenarios and, I don't know, we have samples (inaudible) in the document, I won't talk about that, because that's not the point of the conversation.

So, we invited those comments that do make a proposal. Why? If we do nothing, if we have the same rules, and we go to the next round, we will have the same problem. So the point is trying to build upon the experience, and this is the -- part of the comments that we have received is learning from the experience and trying to refine the rules, which is demanded that we have from the GAC community in Durban. Try to refine the rules, the GAC should work ICANN and with the community in trying to refine the rules for the next round of the New gTLDs.

So the comments that do make a complete proposal on how we could move forward, and how we could enhance this dialogue. And have ideas on how to lower uncertainties, and enhance the process, and make it better, learning from the experience. Other ones that are invited. Of course everyone is invited to attend; unfortunately we have only one hour. We wanted to have it as a more -- broad community session on Monday, but it was impossible finding the space into the different meetings, (inaudible) it was very conflicting, because there are many rooms allocated for the IANA Transition and the Accountability.



So I will stop here, and I'm happy to answer questions. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Olga, for that summary. Any questions, please, in relation to what Olga has -- the information Olga has provided. Bart?

Bart Bostwinkel: Hi, Olga. Just one question for clarification, is going back, say, when you started around the limited scope of this Working Group, the way I have understood the scope of this Working Group, the starting point is the names of country and territories listed in ISO 3166, but what is flowing from this; say, that's the starting point for all policies around ccTLDs and IDN ccTLDs, and it's precisely because of IDN ccTLDs, where it becomes extremely difficult. In some cases you will see that the names of countries in, say, the full names in countries, or abbreviations which has been used in IDNs, are listed on the ISO 3166, et cetera. But they are flowing, and so the question is, is that in the remit of this Group, in your view, or is that in the remit of, say, your Working Group?

Because the starting point -- Let me explain why, the starting point, especially from the ccNSO's perspective, was you have some names of countries and territories especially; a very good example, say, for example, Dot-RF in Cyrillic, which is RF; which is the IDN code for the Russian Federation. At the same time, which would have been a logical choice as well, is Dot.Russia in Cyrillic. According to the rules of the IDN ccTLD fast track, they are not eligible, because they have chosen already Dot.RF, but it's very strange if you end up in a situation that, because of this rule, and maybe in time that rule can be alleviated, it is eligible as a New gTLD, because that's the implication that that was a major concern for starting the Study Group in the first place.

It's because you've got this limitation to one string per country in a specific script, that the other strings, like Russia and Cyrillic, would not fall under this mechanism. Another example why the Study Group started and why the Cross Community Working Group is looking at it is, again, the name of the country. In this case that's the -- I think Norway is a very good example; because I know this one and it's documented in the Study Group Report. Say, another rule in fast-tracking and in the overall policy, is that the language in which all the name of the country needs to be a



designated language. Effectively it means an official language of the country, but that caused some confusion, because designated language, it has the same definition, and it's derived from what is in the U.N. EGN Manual.

It's a language used in administrative, in methods. For example, text (ph) issues, or in text (ph) law, et cetera, under which you can apply. Now, unfortunately for -- or fortunately, depends on where you are from, French is not Norwegian-designated language. However, if you would look at, say, the IDN -- sorry, the name in French for Norway is Norvège, that would be eligible as an IDN. Again, in future that could change and now the question is, again, although, say, ISO 3166 is clearly including Norway, because it's listed on there, do you think an example like Norvège, is but say -- of trying to define a framework for this Group, or should it go and stay within the -- in say, the GAC Working Group. These are just two examples, and there are others as well, and that's probably -- that was the background of, say, the Study Group.

Olga Cavalli:

Thank you, Bart. It's a very good question. You know, this is very challenging because there are many boundaries I don't know, so strict, and things go back and forth. I should go back to the Working Group to ask this question, just to give you an answer now, I think those problems would be of this Working Group. What we are trying to focus is, on (inaudible) in any way, in any list, but are relevant for communities, sub-regions, regions, rivers, and I know it's very challenging because there are big rivers, small rivers, big regions, big sub-regions, and they are not in this, that's the point.

For communities those names have a value, for the countries and for the governments those names have a value for other law -- rules, those names are available, just because they are not (ph) on the list. So what we can do to have some rules, to lower the uncertainty for, say, a company that wants to apply for that sub-region name, and the country that could think that they have some -- their communities, the millions of people that live in that big place, they have a say about that. So I think that the example that you mentioned it's very good for your Working Group, but we, of course, we can work together. But I should go back to the Working Group and bring the question to the whole group.



Bart Bostwinkel: Let me -- and I think the question was raised, and I specifically focused, because that's in the Charter, and I think -- and that's the only concern for the -- from the ccNSO, only is talk about, say -- or the names of countries, or in principle, the countries and territories which are listed in ISO 3166, that's the starting point. All other geographic boundaries, or terms. Like, rivers, sub-regions, cities -- or names of cities and towns, are completely excluded of this Working Group, and I think that's one of the reasons why it was set up, going back, why it was set up as a Cross Community Working Group, and that's why the GAC was invited at the time, because it's -- I think in everybody's interest that especially at the level of the names of countries and territories, that it is done in a joint fashion. And that you don't have two initiatives going at the same -- dealing with the same topic. Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: I think it's totally complementary, that's our vision. We can work together. There are some things that could be -- maybe overlapping a little bit, but I don't -- I don't see a -- really, a big overlapping. We are focusing on (inaudible) things, and we know that there are legal challenges. We know that, and we face them, and honestly, for the government, what (inaudible) and ECs started to do, for the GAC it was not easy, it was not easy. There were early warnings, not easy, the GAC Advice, and finally things happen, and it brought uncertainty to the companies, uncertainty to the governments, so that's the point of our work.

And this is whether, if you go to the Durban communiqué it says; refine the rules in trying to -- and it specifically talks the rules of the initiative, is to avoid this that happened again. So it's not on the list, that's the work of the Group, and this is why the GAC is involved. And we talked about it, it was here in Singapore that we had the conversation in the Collyer Room, and we said, let's try not to overlap. And I think we are not overlapping. I think that we are complementing our work. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Could I take a queue for comments, please. Just so we don't descend into pandemonium. Good. Thank you.

Daniel Kalchev: (Inaudible).

Heather Forrest: Daniel? All right. I have Daniel from the Cayman Islands. Anyone else would like to join the queue. Tell me -- I'm sorry, tell me your name?

Elisa: Elisa.

Heather Forrest: Anyone else to join the queue? And I'll join after Elisa. So, Daniel. If we can the roving microphone to you, please.

Daniel Kalchev: So a typical example of what we are talking about, and this serious, uncertainty, the Cayman Islands, and then a German company that makes cars have a Cayman (inaudible/audio skip) --

Heather Forrest: For the record, Lars says is a beautiful car. Thank you, Daniel, the helpful example. Elisa, please.

Elisa: Thank you. I've been part of this Group too, for a while that I've been swallowed by the CVG (ph) process, so I have been out of the picture for a long time, but I just wanted to say that, when I listen to this conversation, it's like, would it be helpful if we had some kind of approach in the GAC where we explained our group towards this group, and to align and be more systematic towards what you are doing, and that is a complementary exercise, that looks into the GAC concerns on this, but it doesn't -- would it be helpful if we had some sort of -- a more official, or what shall I say, explanation, so that at least for the community, it doesn't look like we are --

Unidentified Participant: Can I add something to that?

Heather Forrest: I'll respond to start with, and then Oram (ph), I'm happy to enter your name to the queue. Elisa and Paul, would you like to be in the queue? I have this written down in my notes, as a suggestion. I suppose what this group would like to see, given the nature of its comments, is





some acknowledgement, formal acknowledgement, of your group, of the work that we are doing, I think I'm struggling, and I know some of my Co-Chairs struggle with the use of this term "complementary" because that, in its very nature, suggest two parallel work streams.

In principle, the GAC expressing its comments in a particular area, that that's your prerogative. Let's say, that's something that the GAC can do, but we have formed a Cross Constituency Working Group, to which the GAC has been invited. And the community has empowered this Group to deal with recommendations and related to -- in relation to names arriving on the 3166 list. So to the extent that your group is able to somehow fold its efforts in to this group, in relation to that specific question, that would be preferable. That would be in -- consistent with the formation of a Cross constituency Working Group, of which you, too, are members. I'll take comments on that, and then come back to another point, if I may.

Elisa: I think the approach the GAC has had, the reason why we have be these working the GAC, and used -- correctly Olga, if you think it's wrong, but it is a general concern or experience with the gTLD process. You know, that we in certain regions, a good example of conflicts, with governance. So it's always going to be there; as a concern in the GAC, you know, the use of geographical terms. So I think -- but it is very unfortunately if we have a process that seems like it's diving into your -- you know, with different views, or emerging your groups, or this group in the wrong way. So I think it's very -- when you said that you want an acknowledgement of this being the Cross Community Working Group, I think that is very useful, I think that the GAC should do that. Do you have any (inaudible) complement?

Olga Cavalli: I want to complement to Elise's (ph) comments. Thank you, Elise for that, and you are totally right. Maybe complementary is not the right word. English is my second language, and I have my limitations. So, if you have another word that could say that it's a work that it's not exactly the same, and its focus in a different to other problems. We could be happy to use it as -- I'm not a native English speaker, but it's the common language for work.

What I would like to say, is that this would -- which wasn't a working group has become a working group, and lot of attention is on, it has been an evolution, it was an idea that started in the GAC communiqué in Durban, and it has been growing of attention of the whole community,



and this is why we thought it could be convenient to bring comments. We don't know, many people come to us, and say, what is this, it's a GAC Advice, or we don't know. It may become GAC Advice, it may become an issue to report to the GNSO, it may become (inaudible) sent to a process in the future from some countries, or may not. We don't know.

What we know is that it's a concern from government, very important concern about lowering uncertainties by the usage of certain names, which are relevant for our countries, for our governments, for our communities, and also the uncertainties were for the companies that requested those names as New gTLDs. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: I have a queue. I have Bart and then Paul, and Annabeth. Anyone else would like to join the queue? No? And then I'll make some closing remarks after Annabeth. None.

Paul Szyndler: For the record, it's Paul Szyndler, not Bart Boswinkel. And I understand, Olga, English is my first language and often I struggle with it too. But I didn't want to get too far into linguistic gymnastics and having had some experience from the bureaucratic side, I might be less diplomatic than Heather has been.

What I'm conscious of from experience, is that when something comes out of the communiqué, that's a very strong, very clear statement of the GAC that this is an area of interest, and a significant number of governments would like to follow it up, and everything that you'd said already. What I'm concerned about is what we are asking, and I think it's getting towards what Elisa said is, is there room for, in your working document, the one that you presented to the community, and have said, is it about -- well, it's essentially just a working document at the moment, but you are building on the communiqué statement. Is there room for explicitly building in a very brief acknowledgement of the work that is going on in this Group, because -- and we don't even need to go into the details, you just acknowledge this group, and what it's doing, and the area -- and summarize it as the areas of work as outlined in our mandate, in our Charter.



Because we are all working in the spirit of removing confusion, and I think that would. I'm just curious whether it's problematic for the GAC to talk about what it's not doing, as opposed to what it is doing, or whether you've got that level of flexibility to make that mention, and I think that would allay a lot of the concerns, if that was done of the members of this group.

Heather Forrest: Bart?

Bart Bostwinkel: Just one point. And I think that it is, as you said, you are on, say, as a member of this Working Group, and in order to ensure, say, overlap, or avoid an overlap, maybe it would be helpful if some or more of your colleagues would participate in the work of this Working Group as well. I know it's difficult, but at least as observer, participant, and not as full member in order to not to commit to anything as we see, that is a concern for the GAC itself, but it is -- it shows that this Working Group, and if it leaves out areas that you think it would have covered, which it didn't, then you can raise it, or bring it back to your own.

It is to build up, say, to ensure that, say, the starting point is correct, but also down the path forward, say, that delineation between the group, is clear all along the way. And it would be helpful to avoid situations like we see in other cross community working groups that we rely on just one person from the GAC.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Bart. I have Annabeth, and then I'll add Carlos to the queue.

Annabeth Lange: It's Annabeth Lange, for the records. I think that what confused us in this Working Group, mostly, was when we saw the text from the GAC, and their suggestion to include in the paragraph 2.2.1.4. in the Applicant Guidebook, it comprised everything of geographical names, and specifically also country and territory names, and that's when we started to see what's happening here. We are working with country and territory names, and another thing that the words "territory names" are confusing, because it's -- the words of the ISO 3166 list, and its territory in another sense than, for example, Patagonia, to take an example.



It's the territory that's derived from the list, and it's not a nation, not a country, so from the Norwegian part of you it's Bouvet (ph) Island, funnily enough we have adopted BV and adopt SJ, but Norway, Dot.NO, is our country, and then we have two territories that, historically, is in play, is there because the list jump (inaudible) used. So that kind of territory, but it's not the same as region in a country that we want to eventually -- possibly protect.

So that's what, in my view, created the confusion that we would think it was really unfortunate, if this Cross Community Group came up with a suggested solution for the country and territory names from the ISO list, and then include it in your work in the GAC, since you've comprised it all, have another understanding of what kind of methods and tools we should use to avoid the confusion. That's why it's really important that on country and territory names from ISO list, we have to work very closely together. So I think that Paul's suggestion, if we could have some words in your document to clarify the difference, and how we should do this together to find a good result, that would be perfect. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Annabeth. We'll keep our queue. Lisa, I'll add you. Carlos? All right, Lisa (ph)?

Elisa: Well, I see the confusion with us mentioning country and territory names when you have this Working Group, but you have to be aware that country and territory names is part of GAC Advice, it was the gTLD process from 2007. So it's always been there as an expression that the GAC has a concern about this, that's why it's hanging there, that's why it's still part of, let's say, the GAC discussions as such. It's not something that dropped into this Group, or as a parallel, or just popped up, it's always been there as a major concern, for the GAC, and now of course we are. But this Working Group that Olga is having is an internal GAC Working Group, it's just something that looked into the GAC. So I think -- but I think in our working documents we should, maybe, underline that, since we are also part of this Working Group. That's the problem. Physically we were not part of this, it wouldn't be -- the confusion (inaudible) --

Olga Cavalli: We would have to go back to the Working Group and review this idea, but maybe you could send us a text, that you would be happy with, and we can review it in the Working Group, and if we agree, we can add it to the document.



Heather Forrest: Thank you, Olga. That would be really good. And I know, Elisa, that all of us, the (inaudible) and semi principles. I was at the GAC at the time, so I know. And of course I know that the country names are -- it's a concern of the governments. Of course, it's a main geographical name, it's on the top of the hierarchy, but still, since it's already a cross community working groups started to work with it, and really take that seriously. So if we could find a way to leave that work to us, while you are working on the other part, and then we communicate about their borders and their overlaps, and whatever. So if you could make the community aware, more aware, so they are not afraid that if we have two different results, that would be the main thing.

Olga Cavalli: I've been in the GAC many years, you know, and also in the GNSO, I've been around for 10 years in this community, and I've never seen such an openness from the GAC, as of this Working Group, honestly, and you know that. And Elisa can concur with me. So that was our idea to open it as much as possible. We started in Buenos Aires sharing with the whole community, and then we follow with all the other meetings, and then we have this idea of having the comments, through the website, and now we have the summary, that's it's online, from the GAC perspective, it's very much open, the usual work.

Heather Forrest: We'll return to the queue. Carlos, please. Followed by Bart, and I'll join the queue after Bart.

Carlos Gutierrez: Yeah. I feel very young because I haven't been that long, either in the GAC or in ICANN, but I would like to try to wrap up a little bit what we have said here. First of all, there is a historic line as we heard this morning, countries and territories existed well before ICANN was formed, so in the round of the New gTLDs it was obviously excluded, explicitly excluded, as you mentioned as of 2006. And on the one hand, one of the tasks here is to revise the situation as proposed on the strawman, the new round of gTLDs of 2012, I don't know what the official name is, was very successful in expanding (inaudible) in cities with the procedure of consulting to communities.

We shouldn't forget that; that it has been very successful in one-step expansion, and third, the new round brought new problems, or new issues, or new conflicts. I don't want to limit it to rivers or regions or intellectual property or country name, so we should somewhere recognize



this small, historical review that we did here. It would be very informative for any group, from here on, but we need to clean up a little bit the wording. I wouldn't take the responsibility on this side to dictate to you. I mean we can do it jointly, but a very positive word that I heard was "boundaries" probably this one would help us to clarify this work.

We still have a semantic problem in the titles. We are talking about the use, and you are talking about the protection. And this is one that we have to really talk about, because I don't want to draft anything that will bring us about in this conflict, and also I really request that we discuss this openly in a call, or on the mailing list, how we are going to prioritize work, because we know we have other things out there in the lobby, IANA Transition, and things like that, you know. And try to use -- focus this group, really, to a small, step-by-step approach. Those are my comments. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: It's directly related? Yes, Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Carlos. Our idea was that you send a draft, it's not that we will accept it as it is. And the idea is not that we create a group to draft the comment in the blah-blah-blah. The idea is that we have a mention in our document. That's what I got from your comments. And if you send a draft, we can send it to the Group, and review it, and maybe we have comments. We shouldn't make up -- I don't know Elisa if you agree, we shouldn't make a big, new working group about the -- what has to be mentioned in the text, it's just, if you want recognition about the work that you do, that's fine. Send us the text, we will review it.

Heather Forrest: Lisa, and I'm conscious of the queue. We have Bart and myself.

Elisa: It's so funny that when -- that we mention that you -- seen the term used, and we are using this term, protection, because it's the picture of the government to working in other (inaudible) or whatever. But I think we should definitely look into terms, so we don't speak different language, because that's also confusing to us, we've discussed (inaudible) and now we are really talking about different subjects (inaudible/audio skip) --



Could I -- we'll talk about the timeline. Does anyone have all these -- that's has been there for a long time, or have (inaudible/audio skip)? Did we put out the timeline, because I think that's also going to be useful. If we can present to the GAC that this is the Cross Community Working Group, it started there, from 2007 we had the GAC principles then, we have the gTLD (inaudible), and now we have a Working Group internally in the GAC to follow up on our concerns in the first round, and also all the problems that we have because (inaudible) technically, and so on. But that will also, for ourselves, tidy up where we are. It's just working tool --

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. I'm happy to leave Bart to come in on the (inaudible) -- I don't object to the use of a timeline, to the documentation of a timeline. However, this cannot descend into who did what first. This is not what either Group is tasked to do, to say, well who put the line in the sand first, and that's the line that we draw from, because that's obviously not your mandate or (inaudible/audio skip) as we progress in understanding, that this isn't about who put the mark on the sand first.

Unidentified Participant: I totally agree, just as in internal work (inaudible/audio skip).

Bart Bostwinkel: Let me put it -- say, I wanted to answer your question in a different way, I think this goes back to 2009, around the time when -- before, even, the study group was formed. It was at a joint effort, and especially thanks to the GAC, that the country and territory names as, say, derived from the ISO 3166, were excluded from the new -- for the first round of this -- of each. So there is a footnote in the Applicant Guidebook which excludes all country and territory names in all languages. Now, unfortunately, if you just do a little bit erythematic, that is unsustainable, depends on your definition of languages, if you just go for living languages, I think there are about 6,000. I take this times 265, so that's just the official (inaudible), then you end up around 1 million terms, which is, that's the consequence of just this little footnote, and nobody -- that will create confusion, that will --

So, one of the reasons why this Working Group came into existence is to address that issue; and this is going back to the recommendation of the ccNSO Council, or a resolution of the ccNSO



Council, if it shows that this Working Group, this Cross Community Working Group doesn't make enough progress in advance of the second round of new gTLDs, then the ccNSO Council would request the GAC to write a letter again, together with ccNSO Council, the ccNSO as a whole, to extend that rule in the Applicant Guidebook, until such time that, say, there is resolution. So that puts a little bit of pressure on this Group as well, but at the same time, ensures the exclusion of country and territory names in the future because, again, of the IDN issues, out of the second round of New gTLDs. So, that's another way of looking at some (inaudible/audio skip) --

Heather Forrest: -- direct comments? No?

Elisa: What you just said, you know, we know -- some of us knows it, but a lot for the GAC efforts, not as who came first, but just for us to explain within the GAC that we are part of a process, that this not -- the GAC is not holding this, this is an internal thing in the GAC that we are looking at our concerns but we have an obligation to this Group. I mean, that in a sense, it could be useful that we can say that, this will happen then, and then we have the Cross Community Working Group, and like this, and it's only for us to explain that we have the GAC. You know, because, well, people get carried away by discussions, and suddenly you have conclusions or whatever, and you lose the space you are in and where you are.

Bart Bostwinkel: So, it's more an historical overview, what happened when, that's what you mean by timeline.

Elisa: I think when we are discussing it shows that we need that.

Heather Forrest: Thank you. It's important, and I appreciate, Bart, your interjection as to the ccNSO. I think it's very important at this juncture to recognize that we are dealing with policy making that falls under the By Laws with the GNSO. We are talking about gTLD policy and it's a very rich history of negotiation within the GNSO, and its many stakeholder groups and constituencies that would need to be inputted into that, into that discussion.





I was in the queue, and I'll make a few comments here; Olga, go back to the beginning and say, this is my reaction, it's not one -- it's something that -- a phrase that you've used, I haven't talked to any of the Co-Chairs, and the Group about it, but this characterization of comments; no, we don't like it, no we don't like it, but we may engage in for the dialogue, yes we like it, in terms of the comments to your proposal. I do believe, having read all the comments, that that's not an accurate -- and again, we are not talking linguistic semantics here, but I think that characterization is very unhelpful. It creates an antagonistic environment; this, no we don't like, and we are going to sit in a corner and sulk kind of an attitude. I would not be able to characterize the comments that we have drafted as Co-Chairs of this Group, as sitting in any of these baskets. No, we don't like it, and we are not going to speak to you. Or, no we don't like it, but we may need some further dialogue. I don't think that that's really a helpful characterization. And going to that, where the participants in the Panel that you have on Wednesday, were they selected across those baskets of types of comments? Or how was it that the Panel was constituted?

Olga Cavalli:

The Working Group felt that it could be useful to hear those that have proposals so -- and we included GNSO because some countries of the GAC requested that, and you also requested that, and we thought it was good. But honestly, we didn't receive comments from the GNSO itself, we received comments from the ICC constituency, from their Registry constituency, and I think that's it, and so those type -- do make a concrete proposal on how we could move forward, or how could we do the work from now on, are invited to talk.

Of course, we will have 20 minutes and you are -- happy to join us, and your comments are welcome. And also from the whole community, we only have one hour unfortunately, I take the full responsibility for the wording, it's my lack of knowledge of English. As I said, it's my second language, and I have my limitations. I apologize if it's not good language, and I promise to change it. Thank you.

Heather Forrest:

Thank you, Olga. Again, this is not, if we had this conversation in Spanish, we would find that I had very little to say on it, had mainly to do with ordering beers in bars. I am -- this is not about linguistic ability, but I think in terms of a dialogue, that it's very -- it's sensitive. Now you've mentioned a number of times, that this is a very -- an issue of great concern for the GAC, this is an issue of great concern for the community, as comes out in those comments, and we all need



to be very careful, as to the terminology that we use. And I take Lisa's point that terminology is something across the board, that we all need to be careful of, let's say.

And just to clarify, Olga, picking up on your comment. Do we have cross-representation across that Panel of each one of those, let's say, such a group that's in favor of the proposal, a group that has other options, and then a group that isn't or --

Olga Cavalli: Some in favor; some that are not in favor. We try to invite those that would engage in further dialogue, that we think, that's very valuable; and those that have a completely proposal, and may be don't agree in the full sense of the document, but would engage. Or, they have some ideas on how we could solve the problem. So, those are the ones. The others are happy to joint but, again, we feel if we do nothing, and we just say, we reject the document, we will have the same problems, so we want to focus on those that are constructive.

Heather Forrest: Annabeth?

Annabeth Lange: Thank you, Olga. I think we should appreciate that you have opened up and sent this out, to a hearing, to be honest, because it's a new thing to send the thing, the document out for a hearing, that's very good, because --

Heather Forrest: Is that a comments period?

Annabeth Lange: Yeah. And as you've said, it's an internal discussion in the GAC and you send it out for comments from the community and that's a good thing. So we could have risk that you discussed this all the way in the GAC and then we go to results. So at least now, the community has the possibility to come in, and come with our comments, and we should use this opportunity, all of us, to discuss, to find the solution that's best for the whole community in the end. So I just wanted to say in the end, here, thank you, and thank you for coming here to discuss this with us.



Olga Cavalli: And for clarification, do you want me to send the document to you? Is that what you're -- I cannot hear you very well. Sorry.

Annabeth Lange: Okay. I just wanted to thank you for sending the documents out already. So we've got the comments, and can discuss the different options. Sorry

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Annabeth. That's a very constructive to wrap up the discussion. I believe that it has been a very constructive discussion over time, we are learning more and more about the work that each of the groups is doing. I appreciate the frank discussion that happened here, and I very much hope that that can continue, and I would like to end this topic by emphasizing a comment made, I believe by Bart perhaps, perhaps also by Paul, that it would be very helpful to have more of your colleagues from the GAC here, knowing what we know that this is an issue on which the GAC is divided. It would be helpful to broaden the discussion, let's say. And within this space, not only Wednesday, but within this space, hear the full range of views, and this is a wonderful place, for those views to be aired.

With that, unless there are further questions, looking around the room and seeing none; I will turn to Annabeth to take up the topic of planning ahead, and milestones until Buenos Aires. With that, I excuse myself. Thank you very much.

Annabeth Lange: So the next thing we have on our agenda is planning ahead. It's not that far away to Buenos Aires. So, I suppose we should try to have some more telephone conferences, (inaudible), and the more of the members that participate, the better. It is a little difficult when we have had these conversations, that too few people attend, and to move forward, with the speed we want to do, we need constructive input from the community and the Working Group. At least now we have the strawman, and I supposed that after this meeting we can work more on it, and you have it as well, and since Heather has made this table, it would be of great help if you can look it through and read it and come with some constructive input.



What do you think are the benefits? What is the risk on them? The things you don't like, with the different options. So it's really up to you to see how the speed goes on, we can't do it alone, even if the staff is doing a lot of good work for us, we need you on board.

So, Paul, can you chip in?

Paul Szyndler:

Thank you. It's Paul Szyndler, for the record. I just want to add to what Annabeth said. It ties back to a point that I made earlier about the way this groups works, there is no punishment, there's no repercussion for brainstorming or if their idea is being heard. It's interesting. I'll go back to the Study Group, we had an interesting example. I think Daniel talked about Cayman Islands, and that clashes with The Cayman. Well, it's really the code was Dot.CYM, which had the potential clash for Comrie (ph) and the Welsh, and that's why they went with the full spelling rather than a short one, because it was reserved for the Cayman islands.

There are great examples of Google applying for Android -- sorry, Dot.AND, Dot.EST (ph), and Dot.AAH (ph) , all of which are three-letter codes, all of which this Group had already this group had already discussed when we used them as case studies, and oddly enough soon after we discussed it, Google withdrew their applications for those three. So even if it was just our discussion, it somehow, I think it filtered through to them. So it just goes to show the level of lack of understanding across the community. And it's not a boring, dull academic exercise to come up with these interesting examples, and case studies, and in the same way, the table we've got here in the current document in front of us, is quite stimulating in terms of what it proposes.

Do you leave two-letter codes exactly the way they are now? Do you allow ones that are not currently two-letter codes to be registered or used for other purposes? Or, do you make it an open (inaudible)? Can you use them as new gTLDs? That's usually contentious for anyone around the table from different perspectives, but we want to encourage people to -- it doesn't matter if you say, well of course we can't make it an open slather (ph) because there's a history. That is the start of a conversation, and that's the tone we are trying to set up, both at meetings, and when we change (inaudible).



Annabeth Lange: So is it -- any comments from the floor? Carlos?

Carlos Gutierrez: Yes. I have to insist that this has been a very empty Group, only the Co-Chairs with the help of the Staff. We need more involvement here. I think it's a very important issue, as you've mentioned there are other issues on the table that we have not even discussed on the second-level domain. We have found a rule that nobody -- that allows everybody in the Group to sleep between midnight and 6:00 in the morning. Although I tend to be, at 5:00 in the morning, because we really have Australia, Costa Rica and Europe involved in this exercise, so we have -- but we need to prioritize. Really, really, I focus on prioritizing this work, otherwise we won't look good. And we have to get organized if we want address all issues, or one after the other very, very soon. Thank you.

Annabeth Lange: So, Lars; can you help us setting up the timing -- a timeline for meetings, and depend on how we do it?

Lars Hoffmann: Well, the interruptions we could either -- we can either decide to, whether we should in respect - - decide on principal intervals, if we want to have every two weeks the meeting, which we then, lack of participation we could always cancel on the day, but I think it might be good to have them in the calendar. We could also rotate times, to say, one week the meeting is at -- I'm making up the times -- 6:00 UTC, and the next week it's at 18:00 UTC. So that, you know, everybody at some point might have to go to bed early or late, or (inaudible), Bart, but said, yes, quite.

So that's something I could roll out if you wanted, and we'll see how it goes. I would suggest obviously next week, you know, we are coming down from the meetings so nobody really wants to go straight back in. So maybe in two weeks or three weeks from now we have first meeting, and then we give it a go with every two weeks; and see how that is accepted by the members.

Paul Szyndler: I'm just going to say I've lost one today -- I think a three week, although we are getting very administrative here, a three-week interval, to allow us to better explain the milestones, and obviously it's a simple milestone, as we make progress with the strawman, or the analysis of the strawman, but timings that we can, as the Co-Chairs and the Secretariat, spend a little bit of time,



you know, the first week after, and then as part of circulating that out, Lars proposes a fortnightly schedule, and as he said, we just cancel the -- a lack of interest or a lack of progress. So, unless anybody disagrees to all (inaudible).

Annabeth Lange: And if possible, it will be really nice if one person from the GAC could participate on this once in a while, so we've got a little exchange between this meeting and the next meeting in Buenos Aires.

Olga Cavalli: We will try. I tried, what happens is that sometimes the timing for Argentina was kind of 3:00 a.m., 4:00 a.m., and I have my limits with the calls. So, I can take at 11:00 p.m., at 7:00 a.m., but sometimes in the middle of the night, it's depending on what. But yes, we will try. I will do my best with the Working Group.

Bart Bostwinkel: And it goes to what we just discussed, so if there are more of your colleagues interested, just interested in the topic to see how this is moving forward, yeah, by all means they are invited, and we will include them in the email list, so they are kept abreast to that part of the -- in that way as well.

Annabeth Lange: Or we'll continue to try to have it not later than midnight, and no earlier than 5:00, even that is quite hard for this as well. Carlos?

Carlos Gutierrez: Another comment towards Buenos Aires. Instead of fighting each one to have one-hour session, or one-hour -- or a half-hour session, I would propose that for Buenos Aires we try to get together one-and-a-half-hour session for both. If we start working on that right now, we might be successful. So I hope we can fight for the spot, and think later on how we distribute it within, but my spirit would be that we look for a joint time and not for two separate sessions in Buenos Aires, to talk of all -- whatever title we give the new bundle of geographic issues.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry, Carlos. I don't agree with that. I think it's two different things and, again, I don't know if the word is complementary, or you can find a better one, but that's -- it's a different issue. This is



the Cross Community Working Group, and the other is an internal GAC Working Group, that came out of a mandate of a communiqué. So it's a different thing. We can work together, we can try to -- not to overlap. I think we don't overlap, honestly, or the overlap is few, and we can work on that, but I don't see it as a blending thing, it's a different thing. I don't know, if Elisa, you agree?

Elisa: It's difficult to sit here and to say whether or not the GAC will, you know, merge the discussion, because if the GAC concern internal GAC discussion like we said, so that's nothing we can do. and I guess that we will want to have internal GAC for open, but still internal GAC discussions on the concern of geographical names. But as we have agreed on earlier, it's just to have the wording and the right towards what we are doing, and that it's not overlapping or complementing this. As long as that is done, I don't see a problem.

Carlos Gutierrez: Don't get me wrong. I was talking about timing, just timing and rooms. If we might get the same room back-to-back one hour, one group, and the other one following, and the other, would be a great logistical advantage. I fully respect your position, I was talking only about logistics. Thank you.

Unidentified Participant: Yes. Logistics is also in the GAC rooms for us, and we are stuck in the GAC room. We should (inaudible) different discussions when we can so -- and we don't have like one hour for this, and then a discussion in the GAC afterward, it's not what it's like. So, again -- but it's the dialogue now is there, so.

Annabeth Lange: At least what we care to do, those of us working, sitting in the Working Group, having contact with their GAC representative, and we have had discussion in the Working Group on teleconference, then we had some progress, that stay in contact with your GAC representative, and give them the information we had. So try to keep them updated as to the development moves on.



So is there any other business? Something else you want to share with us or ask? Nothing? Well, let's close up. Thank you very much for your attendance, and have a nice meeting, in the rest of the week.

CLOSED SESSION

