

## TRANSCRIPT

### **Study Group on Use of Names for Countries and Territories Meeting Beijing**

*11 April 2013*

#### Attendees:

Martin Boyle, ccNSO  
Maureen Hilyard, ALAC  
Eduardo Diaz, ALAC  
Annebeth Lange, ccNSO  
Heather Forrest, GNSO  
Avri Doria, GNSO  
Young-Eum Lee, ccNSO  
Sokol Haxhiu, ccNSO  
Joke Braeken, ccNSO  
Maarten Simon, ccNSO  
Annebeth Lange, ccNSO  
Via Telephone: Paul Szyndler, .au (Chair)

#### ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel  
Lars Hoffmann  
Marika Koenings  
Gabiella Schitteck

#### Apologies:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr  
Elise Lindeberg

Bart Boswinkel: Good morning, everybody. Our chair is connected by phone. So if you could use a microphone if you speak up and say your name also for the transcript purposes. I'm Bart Boswinkel, I am staff support for this group.

Paul, are we ready?

Paul Szyndler: Absolutely, always ready, Bart. Thank you, everyone. Apologies for, now that we get down to the real business end of our work, that I'm not actually there with you, but I trust that we'll be able to, through the wonderful work of the IPR we are able to get through this session with me on the phone line.

As I gave a bit of a brief outline at the ccNSO meeting, my interpretation is we are very nearly there. I think we're nearly at a point of being able to wrap up our work, even if it may mean that we're just going to recommend some more. So the purpose of today's session is really to go through, as you would have heard Bart and I discussing a little earlier, to go through our draft final report. Bart circulated a couple of versions of that redlined and then cleaned back on Monday. So I hope everyone has that with them. Bart will work everyone through those changes.

And as I mentioned in my email in response to that, this is really getting towards our final call. People can make another set of comments and then really it would time for the finalization of the report and releasing it out into other hands. The only other agenda item for today is specifically that discussion of next steps where it goes from here and the time frames for getting this all wrapped up.

It would be really helpful for me especially because I can't see the room if we could go around and people could let me know who's there, introduce themselves around the table and then I'll get back to talking.

Bart Boswinkel: Let's do that. So you know I'm here. Can with start with -- who's -- Gabby.

Gabriella Schittek: Hi, Paul. This is Gabi, ccNSO secretariat.

Paul Szyndler: Hello.

Annebeth Lange: Hi, Paul. It's Annebeth Lange (inaudible).

Paul Szyndler: Hello.

Martin Boyle: Martin Boyle in dot UK.

Maarten Simon: Maarten Simon, dot NL.

Joke Braeken: Joke Braeken, dot EU.

Sokol Haxhiu: Sokol Haxhiu, noncom appointee to the ccNSO council.

Marika Koenings: Marika Koenings, ICANN staff.

Lars Hoffmann: Lars Hoffmann, ICANN staff.

Young-Eum Lee: Young-Eum Lee, dot KR and I have apologies from Cheryl.

Paul Szyndler: Thank you, noted.

Avri Doria: Avri Doria, an observer from the gNSO.

Heather Forrest: Heather Forrest from the gNSO.

Eduardo Diaz: Eduardo Diaz, ALAC.

Maureen Hilyard: Maureen Hilyard, I'm with ALAC as well.

Bart Boswinkel: And that was it, Paul.

Paul Szyndler: Wonderful. Thanks, Bart and thank you everyone. Thank you hardy souls for making this 8:00 a.m. session for you today.

Before we just get into Bart wrapping up or going through changes to our final report, I just wanted in particular to thank Annebeth and Heather for their considered comments on the report. And they've been incorporated. Bart did the heavy lifting in terms of going through it and making some amendments to reflect their comments. Particularly when we get to draw peoples' attention to the end of the report because there were some issues there with regards to our final recommendations, which ultimately of course whilst the rest of the content is fabulous, the recommendations are the key point. They reflect the suggestion that Annebeth made and also it somewhat reflects what Cheryl said on our last teleconference. So, that's just something I wanted to highlight.

Again, as I mentioned in my last email, please it'd be great if we could work through this and we will be quite detailed about it because this is everyone's opportunity to make their nearly last comment, so I wanted everybody to be on the same page, so to speak.

With a simple request, again please, ignore the fact that for instance the executive summary doesn't have the -- has a placeholder for the recommendations obviously until we finalize them, inserting the content of the ENESCO report, for instance. Both minor editorial changes, if we could ignore those and take them as a given, it'd be really good if we could then work through the rest of the content and particularly the changes and see how everyone feels around the table about it. And that's probably a good time to hand it over to you, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel:

Okay, thanks, Paul. This is Bart. Going through the changes, and that's why it's a bit complicated, if you look at the redline, at the major changes from more editorial point of view is that the timeline is now in an annex as well as a membership. As a result, you'll see that the numbering of the pages, et cetera, has been changed. I wasn't able to reflect this in the table of contents. So more work ahead.

I want to go through the first changes and that's in the background. You see, and that's page number 4 of the compare document. I think you see there are some small editorial changes there. Are there any comments, remarks, and this is done I think on the basis of say our own read of the document itself. Are there any questions regarding the changes on page 4? Or if anybody has any other remarks on page 4? No? Then we go on to the next set of changes.

Again, this is on page 5. You see here that there is a reference now to the annexes, the timeline. And I'm in page, in deliverable 1 on page, and this is probably a major change, on page 9. What Paul and I have done is add a two paragraph or add a one paragraph, and I'm in the paragraph. How Country and Territory Names are Treated, Paul. We added one paragraph to -- in fact as the rationale for the work of this working group. So let me -- I don't know, has everybody the text in front of them? And I see a comment from Heather.

Heather Forrest:

Just a question, Bart. As I read this paragraph I wondered if it was the cart before the horse, the one way around, specifically the world legal frameworks. If I read the paragraph I think it means that how -- starting with the beginning of the paragraph, how country and territory names are treated and then advancing to the end of it, determines legal frameworks. And I'm really very hoping it's the other way around. Several of my comments have pushed this (inaudible) very clear of the law and making any sort of determination by the law. But if I read that correctly, it was how they're treated determines the legal framework and very often it's the legal framework that determines (inaudible).

Bart Boswinkel:

Yes, in this case it is -- on purpose it's done this way. The way we looked at it is maybe legal framework is the wrong word. Maybe frameworks should be

arrangement. What we were referring to it depends on whether you will enter into a contracted relation with ICANN.

Heather Forrest: I see, contractual relationship.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, that's if it turns out to be gTLD. In some cases, like in some ccTLDs, they are entering to an exchange of letters, accountability framework and sometimes even into contractual relationship. That's why we said legal frameworks or maybe arrangement is the better word for it.

Heather Forrest: Sure. Perhaps legal arrangements with ICANN or something like that.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, okay. Let's --

Heather Forrest: Yes?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, let's change that. Paul, you agree?

Paul Szyndler: Yes, absolutely no concerns there. I will rewind a little bit. Sorry I didn't jump in before. But yet completely agree with Heather's point. I'd also wanted to know, Heather, you'd made a point earlier on what had been on page 5. In fact it still is on page 5, the list of our work, what we've been directed to do. And I believe you made a comment about is it -- would it be prudent for us to tick off what we've done and what haven't and why not, et cetera. So, a brief comment in there about what we've done. That's not there currently, but my short answer is yes, I think that's valuable. That's appropriate for us to mark of what we've done and what we haven't.

The majority of it is of course yes we've done it and for instance, point E about liaising with the IDNs, CCPTP working group. One, well that was as necessary and we didn't really need to because we've got Bart here as the font of all knowledge. So, just clarification about those sort of things would be good and that will be included.

But anyway. Sorry to interrupt, Bart. Yes, to page 9, that change.

Heather Forrest: Just a quick response. Thank you, Paul. I thought it was useful because I simply wasn't sure and my thinking is if those of us on the working group aren't sure then the reader might not be sure either. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Sorry, I have a comment to that as well. It's the same paragraph. When I read it, I really didn't figure out what was in it, so as Heather, if we don't understand it, probably others can't either. If this is the paragraph where you try to explain the impact of whether a (inaudible) name is treated as the ccTLD or a gTLD?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Annebeth Lange: Then perhaps it could be a little more clear if we start the sentence with "have country and territory name." Now whether the country and territory names are treated as a ccTLD or a gTLD and get that a little clearer in the paragraph. Would that be possible? Because I found it difficult to read that paragraph (inaudible).

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, it's a very dense paragraph.

Unidentified Participant: Yes, and perhaps break it up in several sentences.

Bart Boswinkel: Well, I think we could have a stab at it that way. It's the way you and I discussed it, what we knew this is. There is a lot of words and it's very condensed trying to explain there is difference between ccTLDs and gTLDs and what's the impact of

that difference. So we'll have a go at it and try to explain it a bit more, but it's a bit -- it needs to be done at this high level because that, as I said, I think it is the rationale why it's so important to see how country and territory names are treated and in which -- yes, where they will end up.

Okay. Paul, I think --

Paul Szyndler: Yes, not very happy with that. Again we'll take that offline. We can get some comments from Annebeth as well and obviously as we consolidate and add everything into what we call our pretty much final version, we'll draw everyone's attention to those redrafted paragraphs.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. I'll go to the -- any other questions or comments about this paragraph? Because I think this was one of the major changes compared to the previous version. No? Thank you.

The next paragraph in say on this page again. This is based on a private exchange with Annebeth in order to explain why in the overview itself we don't use the terminology consistently. And the terminology is derived directly from the different policies and methodology say like the fast track process. And this paragraph is there to indicate, and maybe it's not clear enough, but to indicate that in the different policies and in the fast track methodology, different terminology is used. And this is precisely one of the major concerns. So if you talk about country names -- country and territory names, say for one policy, it has a different meaning than in another policy.

Any comments, suggestions, feedback? Heather?

Heather Forrest: Thank you for that clarification, Bart, because I wasn't quite sure what that paragraph meant. Maybe could we link it to -- we have later in the report it's a dot point that says we haven't attempted to define ccTLD or country and territory names. Perhaps if we link it to that.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, but --

Heather Forrest: Is that the point that's being made here?

Bart Boswinkel: No, it's more that you see as we go into the overview of the different policies, and maybe it should be in that paragraph, is that we didn't attempt to unify the terminology across the different -- and maybe that's the way it should be rephrased.

Heather Forrest: That's clear. Either that or something along the line of we note that -- yes, I think that's fine if we just clarify the language. I get the point.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, okay. Our work again, Paul.

Annebeth Lange: Another comment from me again. Why we started this was because I notice that in the report sometimes we're talking about country names, other times we're talking about territory names. And then again, other times country and territory names. So just to get it clear that that's not something we have omitted or done wrong, but it's a reason why it's like that.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Any other comments? No? Okay. Again Paul, work to do.

Paul Szyndler: Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: The next current policies or methods, et cetera. This has been updated. I think I'm on page 9 now, basic rule from RSC 1591. Then the rules, and this is to

clarify say the policy for two latter codes. And again, this is as a suggestion, this is the way that based on RSC 1591 the -- how the ccTLDs are created.

The rules for the fast track. So, again to make very clear, this -- the fast track process, as many of you will know, is not a policy in the strict sense. It is a methodology and that's -- I think that we should use that terminology throughout to make very clear there is a distinction between the fast track process and the future overall policy.

I'm on page 10. Some small changes. Any comments on page 10 on the changes? No? We go to page 11. At the request, I think, and I need to check it again in the next version, but at the suggestion of Heather we've made a reference to the latest version of the African guidebook and to my knowledge it's from 2012, the 4th of June.

Any comments maybe on the footnotes? Because these were added as well to -- and maybe just an explanation. This is a bit of the history why the country and territory names are excluded from the African guidebook.

Some small editorial changes on page 12. Any comments on page 12? Nope.

Page 13, I've added the only one IDN ccTLD string to a designated language. Designated language, for those who are not familiar with the terminology of the overall policy, designated language has the same meaning as official language, but to avoid a whole discussion on what is official, what is -- we changed it to designated language. But this is one of the real limiting factors and it's creating problems on its own. So that's why it's included.

African guidebook. Okay, I'm on page number -- this (inaudible) is fast, this page. Page 16, proposed. This is from the latest version from the final report. And it will be -- yes, this is going to be difficult, but this is more an editorial question. Yesterday the ccNSO council adopted the final report, so now we're going into a members' vote and by the time this document is completed and will be submitted, it will probably have been submitted as a policy to the ICANN board. So we need to keep this up to date and we will see that over the next couple of weeks to months that the terminology of this section will change.

I'm on page 19. No changes. And you see some small editorial changes throughout the document. Page 21, 22. On page 24, this is I'd say in the paragraph there is we've added this sentence that the responses received also indicated that it is very difficult and time consuming to engage and involve the appropriate governmental agency or departments. We've added and included this sentence to make clear that to get the appropriate governmental agencies or departments involved in say ICANN procedures or (inaudible), is going to be very difficult and you'll see that maybe in the observation -- the final observations as well. And I think this is a statement of fact, but let's say based on the (inaudible) survey and it makes very clear that's in circumstances even when the GAC is involved, you will have -- they will have problems getting in touch with their own appropriate governmental agencies. So I think it's an important observation to a future work. Any comments on this one? Suggestions? No?

Then we go onto 25.

Annebeth Lange: Bart, just a comment. I have a little problem with the pages in my computer and I've written it out and they're totally confused. Could you just say where or with words in which chapter or --?

Bart Boswinkel: Okay, that's fine. I'm now in say section 5, deliverable 3.

Annebeth Lange: And I have a comment on the deliverable 2. Something on it. It's just something that is missing or something's too much. It's under deliverable 2, official conventional long form and short form name. In the old --

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I'm looking. I'm trying to find it.

Annebeth Lange: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, official conventional -- yes. So for those who have the computer, that's page 20.

Annebeth Lange: First paragraph in that section, it's either something that's missing or it's too much because the last two words, that's (inaudible).

Bart Boswinkel: Where?

Annebeth Lange: As with ISO 3116 (inaudible) code, country and territory long and short form names that are included in the (inaudible) as they are the most predictable common representation of sovereign identity of that state.

Bart Boswinkel: Oh that state, yes.

Annebeth Lange: Something (inaudible).

Bart Boswinkel: Paul, can you see it? We're in the compare version, page 20. And I'll make a note of it that we -- and I think all states so notes. Okay, thank you, Annebeth.

So now I'm moving on. So I'm back on page 21 of the compare version and examples of country and territory names and minority or indigenous languages. There are no changes there. So this is -- we've gone to on the sort of final paragraph of this section. We looked at the -- I'm now in deliverable 3, Annebeth. And on ISO 3166 (inaudible), so that's for the other page 25. We've added the example of dot MK, (inaudible) of in order to complete, say to make a better picture what will happen when, say when Yugoslavia was split.

No changes there. On 26, so further (inaudible) noted the relaunch and rebranding of Columbia, dot CO under auspices of the Columbian government. That's what happened.

Now we go into the -- yes? Go ahead, Maarten Simon.

Maarten Simon: Bart, going back to page -- let me find -- 25. You have written that it's about the deletion of the AN code. And it also includes something about (inaudible), but that's not part of the deletion of the AN code.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, you're right.

Martin Boyle: So it should be removed.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, you're right. Yes, let me make a note of this Martin. And then MF should be removed as well. Yes, that's been a (inaudible). I should have known. Martin.

Martin Boyle: Going back down that list a bit further to the one you just referred to on the insertion of dot MK, there is something wrong with the name of the country because it's (inaudible) the Slavic republic of Macedonia. (Inaudible) and Macedonia therefore (inaudible).

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, this is the way it's listed in the ISO 3166 list and that's limited really.

Martin Boyle: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: And with a comment.

Martin Boyle: With a comment, yes. Okay. It's (inaudible) normally F-Y-R-O-M.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, but this is (inaudible).

Martin Boyle: Okay, it's fine.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, Sokol.

Sokol Haxhiu: Just a very short comment with regard to dot MK. I'm not understanding this. Is this a proposal or what is (inaudible)? What's the idea of this? Because currently the government of Macedonia is in negotiations for deciding on their own name. And this is a very lengthy discussion with Greece and EU.

Bart Boswinkel: I know and one of the reasons is, if you look at it, as I said to Martin, this is the way it's currently entered into the list of the ISO 3166 list. That's why we've got dot MK referring to this name. I know it's very, very sensitive in both countries. We've noted this when dot MK became a member of the ccNSO. And maybe that's -- I think looking back when we started to include it, it is included in fact knowing that it's a very sensitive area, but this is a factual representation of the current state of affairs. But say just having your comment makes very clear that this is a sensitive area.

Any other comments? Yes, Heather, please go ahead.

Heather Forrest: May I make a recommendation because it's two different kinds of changes that are represented on that list. The MK represents an opportunity that there's a possibility in India, a high potential of future change as well.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Heather Forrest: In that sentence that starts off that list, such changes include, could we perhaps add such past and potential future changes include or such past and future changes could potentially, or something like this to trigger that if things that have happened and areas where change may also happen in the future.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Paul?

Paul Szyndler: Yes, absolutely.

Heather Forrest: I think that's useful because it flags particularly in that dot MK example, this is something that may well (inaudible) point to develop.

Bart Boswinkel: We'll change it again, yes.

Unidentified Participant: And I agree with that also. And this is a dynamic process.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: So we can present it.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and that's the major reason why we included all these changes to show, and that's what people tend to forget. They think ISO 3166 is a stable list. Well, it isn't. It is --



Okay, we're moving on. Back to -- I'm on page 27, other currently used acronyms and (inaudible). So the first table --

- Paul Szyndler: By the way, Bart, I think the pagination is out by about one. So what you're calling 27 seems to be 28 for the rest of us. So yes, as Annebeth said, if you refer to the sections, that'll be the best thing.
- Bart Boswinkel: Yes, sorry. So I'm now in section official and conventional long form and short form names again. And the change is there. So that's under the second table.
- Paul Szyndler: And Bart, if I may, just to explain, obviously a lot of study group members will recognize these tables or slide or diagrams that were put in. My intent was I simply pulled those straight out of the discussion. Not everybody may have seen them if they were not at a particular meeting. They're not ones we just made up, it's ones that we actually worked through and discussed at our sessions. So I thought it was quite relevant here. They haven't been made up for the purposes of this final report, they're something that should be familiar to all of us, so that was the intent to give some illustrated examples.
- Bart Boswinkel: Now the next page, and especially the bit I know, say the final table on dot NO. Annebeth suggested also Iceland, but this one was discussed as Paul just said. And what is interesting is maybe we -- I don't know if we need to discuss it say (inaudible), so with the Latin character, the (inaudible). It's not (inaudible), it is potential view, say the overall policy, but say what is the issue here is not a designated language.
- Annebeth Lange: No but I think that it doesn't show the whole thing because if (inaudible), it's one thing. But if French had been a designated language in Norway, then it could have been a ccTLD. So perhaps it would have been better. Why I suggested Iceland is that they have the one non-ASCII letter in their name. So that's why we don't -- there it is a designated language. And if in Norway, for example, (inaudible), that is a designated language in Norway. So (inaudible) or Norway in (inaudible), that would have been a ccTLD. But Norway would be a ccTLD and it's -- Norway's just an example. It would never happen in Norway anyway. But some countries would absolutely have that problem.
- Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and I think because of Norway, because it's French, everybody recognizes it's French. That makes it interesting because it's not designated and maybe, I don't know, if you do have an (inaudible) version of Norway, if you could provide it and include it, because that would make an IDN ccTLD because it is a designated language. And then it becomes very clear that it's very messy.
- Yes, Paul?
- Paul Szyndler: I'm very happy with that. I think Annebeth having the comfort with us using Norway as an example, people might get squeamish about being identified or having a country identified in that way. But I'm very happy to add every example that we feel is relevant. So happy to put that one in.
- Bart Boswinkel: And drill this down a bit, I tried to change it, but I couldn't change the tables.
- Paul Szyndler: That was a set editorial thing, it was a set image, Bart.
- Bart Boswinkel: Yes. So I'm not in country and territory names in six official languages of the UN. So that's state, the (inaudible) I believe. Yes. No changes there. Examples.
- Then there is on page 33 the final paragraphs of examples of naming unofficial language. Again it's more by exclamation maintained by (inaudible). We need to change that a bit because it's really standing out.

I'm now in deliverable (inaudible), study recommendations. And I think this is where the major changes would be exceptional. First of all, the comments and observations of this study group. So the second observation, again it's done to reflect the dynamic character of the lists. The third one -- so no comments there. The third one is we've included the term end user. And there is a new observation, so that's number 5 I believe. Yes.

Again, it is part of the -- it will be part of the overall policy that -- the mechanisms of review. Any comments, suggestions here on the observations? No?

Then we go into the recommendations. We've included two recommendations. Take your time to read them. I don't -- any comments, suggestions for these two included? Yes, Heather.

Heather Forrest: In regards to the first paragraph, I think it's important that we explain why. If that's the recommendation, I mean it comes out of the blue actually.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay, yes.

Heather Forrest: And to the extent that -- and it's important, let's say to the extent that we are saying that we think that this ties to the observation made above that this is extremely complex, then I agree with that. If there's another reason as to why these are excluded, then I'm not sure if I agree.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Heather Forrest: If the point is that there's just this is such a mess that we don't dare to stick our toe and try and draw a line in the sand as to what these things are and what to do with them, then I'm all for that. But if there's some other reason --

Bart Boswinkel: No.

Heather Forrest: -- then I'm not with you.

Bart Boswinkel: No. No, fully agree. Paul, any comments on that one?

Paul Szyndler: So Heather, just to be really clear, and I'm sorry we're repeating back -- I'm repeating back to you what you just said, but obviously it's quite important that we get this bit right. We've made certain arguments or conversations or observations throughout the paper about the complexity of issues surrounding the use of country and territory names. And the whole point is that having made that observation, and based on that, we would recommend -- make that recommendation. So if we've said it before, we then make a recommendation based on it, but you'd like to make it explicit that we're making a recommendation on those grounds because of the complexity associated with these issues. Is that -- have we got that right?

Heather Forrest: Correct, yes. I think there's just -- if we had someone advance to the very end of this document and didn't have the benefit of an explanation, they might think there was some other reason for which we're making this recommendation and I think it ties the entire report together quite well that we say that having observed this, which we've reported on in the report, that we then for that reason make this recommendation.

Bart Boswinkel: And maybe to make it even clearer and say the second recommendation follows precisely this argument that say until say this has been resolved by a mechanism such as this cross community working group, that say the consecutive rounds,

new gTLDs, more country and territory names will be excluded. So it's not definite, but it's for the time being to make that clearer as well.

Heather Forrest: I agree, yes. I think that needs to be made much clearer, yes. I would say the first recommendation is something along the line of in light of the complexity observed in and discussed in the report above, we recommend a hold until such time as recommendation 2.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: My suggestion would be to change the order. To first start with the recommendation 2.

Bart Boswinkel: Oh, yes.

Unidentified Participant: And then say okay, as long as there's nothing coming out of that, we should --

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: Yes?

Bart Boswinkel: It's something like this, but at least it's very clear these two recommendations are tied together and we need to provide a rationale for the first one because that's probably the most impactful recommendation. And yes, and then the recommendation 2 is the path forward. That's why I would like this order here because we say okay, for the time being do this, but we have a mechanism to resolve it. Yes, it's a way of -- they tie together. And what is the best order we'll check on once we've got a, say draft final language and we share it with the group. Any other comments on these two sections? Heather?

Heather Forrest: Just one more comment. Apologies, Bart. In terms of the last sentence of that second paragraph, should be invited. Forgive me if that's -- if what I'm about to say is not very diplomatic, but I would prefer that that -- I mean I suppose it's evident in the words cross community working group, but I think it's imperative that we have a truly cross community group here. That this isn't simply should invite, but in fact that we stress that this needs to be (inaudible) to many.

Bart Boswinkel: Must be advised.

Heather Forrest: Yes, please.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, done. And -- no, I don't want to go there. I will go there. You could even -- but that's maybe something that's a bit out of scope, but you could think of a board working group like the geographic regions board working group. Then it has and it's clear reporting back to the board in order to resolve this.

Heather Forrest: I wonder if we get ourselves into that policy implementation morass that we're all feeling the pain of right now. When we involve the board and what does the board do with the results of such a working group? That's been heavily disputed this week and I think there's sensitivity or I'm not, so perhaps if we avoid that quagmire and --

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, that's some of the sensitivity (inaudible) doesn't have.

Heather Forrest: It's been fair enough. Fair enough. As soon as we involve the gNSO. I think the point that I wish to make is simply that we ensure that it's not simply a may invite so to say. It's a truly a cross community group.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Noted. So, that concludes, as Paul said we will include the full summary of those. Are there any other comments by the way? These two sections? Are there any other suggestions or recommendations? Or do these two capture the sense of -- yes, have a go at it. Capture the sense of -- Annebeth?

Annebeth Lange: I think we have (inaudible) very well that this is a complicated field. And the thing you have recommended here captures all we have been talking about in the report. So as long as we state very clearly that we will look into the complexity and see if we can find a solution and until then -- at least until then we just leave it as it is today. And anyway, so many gTLDs out there now, so they have to solve these problems first anyway. So the second round we don't know when that will come anyway. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Thank you, Annebeth. So as I said, the annex will be included and then the maybe changes are and there are no editorial changes to the list of members, although it's one that we included in (inaudible). And maybe I should include Lars' as well. And yes, (inaudible) as member of the ISO 3166 maintenance agency.

Okay, Paul. I've run through the documents. We've noted the -- and I noted some of the changes. Back to you.

Paul Szyndler: All right. Thank you, Bart and thank you, everyone. I appreciate it. That was a painstaking exercise, but I hope everyone can appreciate that at this time it was very important for us to go through this line by line. The next course of action will be Bart and I will make the changes as discussed, make sure, as I mentioned, the ENESCO material's just missing at the moment because he's going to get an official okay with regards to the inclusion of that material. It was agreed previously, but just to make sure that that's explicitly agreed upon again we'll make the editorial changes and they're not substantial, so thank you. That's a very good thing.

And we will then get that back out to everyone in the group for a final comment as soon as possible. It's actually back to you from now, Bart, because oddly enough I'm relatively new to this sharing study groups in this environment. As I mentioned during the 10 minute update that I had, which wasn't really enough time to go into any sort of depth or detailed briefing for the ccNSO on what we're doing, everyone -- ccNSO members will see this report. They will have an opportunity to analyze and look at it as well. To date, I think Lesley's comments reflected that a lot of people are quite happy for this group to go away and do its difficult work. And then everybody will follow a little more closely.

We slipped behind the regional deadlines, that wasn't the problem because ultimately we were just trying to get in before round two of the new gTLD process, and we've done that comfortably. But I didn't want our timeframes to slip much further. As far as I'm concerned, we're very near the conclusion of our drafting work. We now have a report that we can deliver and put out. Bart, did you have some comments specifically about the expectations of the process from here?

Bart Boswinkel: No, I think but that's up to the study group, so we can go -- I think in order to share this more broadly is that we finalize it and the question is do we want to open it up for public comments, yes or no and start the discussion? If we do it, then we will go beyond Durban meeting. We can also -- and that's an alternative as well, because that we sent this out as a final report of the study group. And it will be discussed, say in the different SOs and ACs. And they come back to the ccNSO council. Because this is the report from the study group to the ccNSO council.

Paul Szyndler: (Inaudible) chair I don't have a predilection one way or the other. I'm conscious of timeframe, but I'm also (inaudible). There was a bit of mixed feedback on Tuesday as the awareness or interest or knowledge of the group and it's hard when people hold up, (inaudible) to understand exactly why they did. But I'm not prescribing a particular course of action from here on out. That's something that I would welcome members' comments on.

Bart Boswinkel: I figure it's more to the participants, especially from the gNSO and At-Large, to check what would be your preference. Would we send it out for public comment or submit it to the ccNSO council?

Heather Forrest: I think sending it out to public comment would probably be a really good idea to try and get more people to actually have read it and thought about it and understood it, so. We were just sort of while you were talking, talking about how now to sort of get it back to the gNSOs so that they can talk about it and see what's there. So comment, yes. Going through the comment cycle would be a perfect thing I think.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay, I think, Paul, we got our path forward. And do you maybe as a -- that's again, this is the way the ccNSO do their business. What we could do is either include the Durban meeting in the public comment period and in order to inform the people or we could do it prior to the Durban meeting, but then it's going to be really people reading it and without the additional explanation. So again, that's more the way you -- it's up to the gNSO what you think is the best way forward. Marika and then Heather.

Marika Koenings: Yes, this is Marika. I mean one way you may consider is just before you put it out to public comment request a meeting with the gNSO or with the gNSO constituencies and stakeholder group to give them a brief like in the form of a webinar for example. So then you have the people that you can read them what is in the report and then encourage them to submit to the public comment forums. Or present to one of the council meetings so that councils can take it back to their groups. And again, those groups that want further information can come back to you or the working group for a briefing or further information. In that case, you don't have to wait to Durban to put it out for public comment, but give people an opportunity to come to you if they want more detailed information.

Bart Boswinkel: It is more structuring in the closure of this working group.

Paul Szyndler: Can I put my hand up? I'm sorry to jump the queue?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, go ahead.

Paul Szyndler: I appreciate that comment. That's certainly very useful and what we're at great pains to make very clear here is that there's no desire to try to -- as everyone on the group can appreciate, we have a report here, which is largely saying we've done our thing. It is a complicated issue. And from here we recommend further work. So there's a logical desire to let's start getting towards that further work just this result in working group getting started. And we're weighing up that divider start moving with intention of we want to be consulted and open.

So if what is going to work best to constituencies is SOs and ACs is webinars or intercessional briefings or briefing to council. While we will do that to the ccNSO council anyway, so yes, basically I would like to do an intercessionally, but only from the desire to get this moving as opposed to having it atrophy for another few months. And then we brief people at Durban. It's a public comment period, it's not closed. We then need to extend it beyond Durban.

So I hope everyone can appreciate it's not a pressure -- it's not a desire to rush at all or try to get it under the radar, just rather brief everyone as best we can to try to use the inter meeting timeframe if we possibly can. So look, Bart and I will work on that. We will need to brief the ccNSO council on our next steps as well, because (inaudible) as we keep going specifically in regard to our timeframe. So I think we'll take that under advisement and factor that in. But I think I jumped in front of Heather.

Heather Forrest: Just a question. I'm not saying anything (inaudible) the process. I think all the recommendations that have been made are very good. Just so we all are very clear, the next step then will be that these changes that we've talked about today will be incorporated into the draft and that will be circulated again to all of us?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Heather Forrest: That's fine. So then that's what we anticipate for the next step is the revised.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and this can be done because there are no -- not really major changes, so this can be done on a relatively short time scale in our life. And then I think based on the final (inaudible), that will be the final draft version and once more and then it's -- then we're ready for public comment or submission. And I think listening to everybody here my advice would be we go for public comment. And as Marika suggested, even a webinar on this topic halfway at the start of the public comment period for those who are interested. Say and that could be a really cross community. Maybe now I would say two on a one day so we cover all the time zones as well. And so with the goal to -- I think it would be nice if we would have say, the public comment closed just after or just at the Durban meeting so that we can submit it to the current council. Yes?

Paul, anymore remarks, questions from your end?

Paul Szyndler: No. Thank you, everyone. I'm conscious we've just taken up the whole hour. Bart and I -- it's still a little vague with regards to the specific timings of the next steps. That's because we'll go away and work out the details, circulate to everyone, probably with email of the -- of what we hope will be the final draft. Otherwise, thank you, everyone. That's it for me.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, thank you. And thank you from my end as well. Good day.