ICANN
Transcript
CWG on Country and Territory Names as TLD's
Monday, 02 May 2016 at 20:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording, although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.
The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ctn-02may16-en.mp3

Attendees:

ccNSO:
Annebeth Lange, .no
Ron Sherwood, .vi
Sebastien Pensis, .eu
Sanna Sahlman, .fi
Paul Szyndler (co-Chair), .au
Mirjana Tasic, .rs
Grigori Saghyan, .am

GNSO
Heather Forrest, IPC (co-Chair)
Carlos Raul Guttierez, NPOC (co-Chair)
Colin O'Brien, IPC
Robin Gross, NCSG
Griffin Barnett, IPC

ALAC:
Cheryl Langdon-Orr

GAC:
Panagiotis Papaspiliopoulos

Apologies:
Maxim Alzoba, NTAG (GNSO)
Susan Payne, NTAG (GNSO)
Jaap Akkerhuis (ISO 3166 Expert)
Laura Hutchinson, .uk (ccNSO)

ICANN staff:
Joke Braeken
Lars Hoffman
Brian Aitchison
Bart Boswinkel
Terri Agnew

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the CWG on Country and Territory Names as TLD's taking place on Monday the second of May 2016.

On the call today we have Robin Gross, Heather Forrest, Annebeth Lange,Sanna Sahlman, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Colln O'Brien, Ron Sherwood, Mirjana Tasic, Sebastian Pensis and Carlos Raul Guttierez.

Joining us a little later will be Paul Szyndler. We have listed apologies from Maxim Alzoba, Susan Payne, Jaap Akkerhuis and Laura Hutchinson

From staff we have Joke Braeken, Lars Hoffman, Bart Boswinkel, Brian Aitchison and myself, Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and I understand Lars, you'll be taking over from here -- I turn it over to you.

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars. Terri, I think that -- and if (unintelligible) -- somebody misinformed you -- so I'm going to put it -- have that (exchanged today). Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Good morning everyone. This is (Heather). Thank you very much, Lars, and thank you very much, Terri. And welcome to our meeting of the cross-(community) working group on the country and country names and TLDs.

You will see that we have an agenda in our Adobe Room which, of course, begins with the welcome -- we've just done that. We have our typical GNSO introduction slide on the screen at the moment which reminds you to connect your audio and make sure that you have either dialed into the bridge -- and if you need help with a dial out -- please let Terri know or by activating the microphone within Adobe Connect.

And as also a reminder -- which is a good one -- to update your statement of interest if you haven't done so lately and you have some changes. I also (just want to) as a housekeeping point, that Terri has very kindly pointed out the Wiki Agenda Page in - early on in the Chat for the group.

With that in mind as a starting point, we have our agenda items. You'll see in - that the first thing that's on our agenda is acknowledging the comments received on the paper that we're calling in effect (Larson) (Ingenuity) and the (Straw Woman).

I've got papers that's out - our thinking on - or a proposal really that was developed from the input that was received from our informal survey on three-character country codes.

And we - you may have noted in the email that went around with the agenda for this week's meeting, we noted in preparing for this meeting that we've received in the meantime -- since the last meeting. And it seems that there was maybe some concern as to whether it had made it onto the list at the last meeting -- but kind of (Jeff)'s comments on the (Straw Woman).

In the meantime, we also received comments from -- I believe it was (Collin) in the interim. And so I suppose one of the things that struck us was that (we) had received comments and we're very, very grateful for the comments that we received.

We haven't received numerous comments. But the comments that we have received have been in some ways -- not entirely -- but in some ways quite diametrically opposed or preventing -- if you like -- very, very different perspectives.

We anticipated that. We had a feeling -- and it was why we started with two letter codes. We thought it would be the least controversial -- is the right word -- the least controversial place to begin. And as we move along in our work, we expected that the past would get harder and the positions would get more devised and maybe that is panning out.

So with that in mind, I've acknowledged the (few) comments that have come in since out last meeting. Have I missed - does anyone know of any comments besides those that have come in in the meantime? I wouldn't like to forget anyone at this stage.

Lars, maybe you can help me here and remind me -- are those the only two that we've received in the meantime?

Lars Hoffman: Thank you (Heather). This is Lars. I'm sorry I didn't raise my hand. We - you're right that these are the two comments that we received on this (Straw Woman) paper.

In addition, I think (Unintelligible) thought (Berlin) started some discussion on the list surrounding the (Straw Woman) paper. But this wouldn't comment directly on the paper, but I think something that would be very useful in the forthcoming discussion. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Wonderful. Thank you, Lars, that's great. And just for the record -- apologies for not being absolutely clear when we first started out. I was referring to (Collin O'Brien)'s comment. (Collin O'Brien) is an attorney with (Partridge Partners) and a member of the (IPC).

So that puts us in an interesting position, let's say, and I know (Paul Soother) isn't yet on the call -- he's coming -- he's joining us shortly, but isn't on the call.

We have (unintelligible) on the call and (Carlos) -- the four of us make up the co-chairs for this group. And we met with staff in preparing for this call to think about how to move forward in light of the fact that we have these comments and they're quite different -- and they're not tremendously numerous.

And one of the things that we realized -- perhaps we have a unique opportunity in the fact that we have this meeting scheduled before us. And specifically -- but let's say the different elements -- but the very different element and then we (unintelligible).

And can we somehow harness the power of Meeting B and the intention of Meeting B as a policy form to flush out perhaps the differences. (Unintelligible) the comments that have been received -- perhaps fill in the gaps on places where we haven't received comments.

And I would see if this can somehow help us in our work. And with that in mind, we have canvassed some -- let's say very high level ideas as to what each of our communities is doing with GNSO and the ccNSO as to how we're planning to use Meeting B.

And it seems that no one's entirely sure yet what we're doing with Meeting B. And perhaps we can say a few things about that. I'll give a very, you know, few words about what the GNSO is thinking.

I might turn it over to Bart and Annebeth to say some comments about how the ccNSO is approaching Meeting B. And then perhaps Cheryl might offer some comments from that perspective. And from there, what I'd like to do is springboard and ask how do we -- the CWG and Country Territory (Meeting) -- how do we use Meeting B?

From a GNSO perspective, we have largely designed our -- and are in the process of designing -- our schedule around our ongoing PDPs -- our Policy Development Process. The GNSO -- you might know or recall -- is tasked on the ICANN bylaws with managing the Policy Development process for policy relating to generic (unintelligible) domains.

We have a number of PDPs "Live" at the moment -- two of those dealing with the next round of (UGTLD) expansion. One, which is the (unintelligible), named subsequent procedures PDP -- new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP. And the other one is the RPM PDP -- (unintelligible) Protection Mechanism PDP -- evaluating all of the rights, protection (unintelligible) from the 2012 expansion round.

So our work is largely -- large chunks of time more than the usual -- say our time slots that would be given in an ICANN meeting as we know and love them. Larger chunks of time devoted to face-to-face meetings for those PDP working groups.

That is largely the focus of our schedule, in addition to meetings in the GNSO Council that (Carlos) and I will both attend. And I think our only face-to-face meeting -- formal face-to-face meeting is with the GAC primarily to discuss issues around IANA transition.

So we're taking things very differently than we ordinarily would. Bart or Annebeth -- could I perhaps turn to you to say a few words about how this…

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: ...the upcoming meeting?

Bart Boswinkel: Annebeth, you want to go or do you want me to do it? Annebeth? I think Annebeth is on mute. Annebeth, go ahead. No, let me - I hope you can hear me.

Annebeth: Yes I can.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, so…

Annebeth: Hello?

Bart Boswinkel: Oh, Annebeth, go ahead.

Annebeth: Yes, okay. I think that the GNSO and the ccNSO -- the way they are conducting their meetings -- they're quite different. So when - usually they don't discuss the PDPs in the same way as you do and we have more member or different (CCs) conveying what's happening in their role -- and also common interest to which the other stakeholder groups.

But I think that Bart knows the program, so I have - think better than I do. So Bart, perhaps you could enlighten us a little on what's the plan so far?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, it's almost - the way it's been approached by the ccNSO program working group is almost like considering Meeting B as the ordinary meeting. So there will be -- say Tech Day on Monday and then - and that's the difference with the ordinary meeting.

There will be full ccNSO days until 3:00 pm. And as of 3:00 pm -- at the request -- and looking at Meeting B and the purpose of Meeting B -- from 3:00 pm to 6:00 pm I'll still open for cross-community work.

So if ccTLDs want to attend one of the slots, they are more than invited to attend those. And secondly -- and knowing say some of the topics that are

proposed for the cross-community sessions -- are not really of interest to the C - to ccTLDs.

There is -- say the ccNSO itself or under auspices of the ccNSO -- the - there will be some cross-community work and community slots open to everybody like the whole meeting. You have on topics of interest to the ccTLD community organized by the ccNSO.

So that's the main difference -- in the afternoon from 3:00 to 6:00 -- there is not the regular ccNSO sessions. From 9:00 to 3:00, there is the regular ccNSO sessions -- and what is the difference as well -- is normally the Council Meetings are Wednesday. It will now be on Thursday just before lunch.

So that's how the ccNSO Meetings look like, so there is - you have the cc -- there's plenty of opportunity to participate in cross-community work.

Heather Forrest: Great. Thanks, Bart, very much. Cheryl, your hand is up -- please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, (Heather) -- Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I just wanted to let you know that -- like the rest of the community -- I (like) it at large is finding the challenge in coming to terms with how we best operate a Meeting B program.

But also additionally because what we have done in the past is take our outreach responsibilities very seriously. We've got an additional challenge with Helsinki -- being the mid-summer -- is vacation period. Universities (unintelligible) all those places we'd normally interact with -- just not going to play with us.

In fact, we've been told it'll be a ghost town that we're trying to get around. So -- which will be good for walking -- but those who like to walk. But it's certainly not going to make outreach very easy.

So like the rest of you, we're focusing on our work groups and on our attendance and interaction with existing policy meetings when and where we know they're on.

We have a fairly flexible -- it's down in writing and in draft form -- but we will be moving the pieces around to (suit) once we know what work group meetings are happening when.

But we also will be focusing on making sure our afternoons are available for cross-community activities. And we're very keen to find out which and what of those is going on -- and of course many of them and those active members in other policy activities.

So we'll probably be spread in a little ways across the other activities the whole time. And just before you ask what that sounds like -- this means to all of us -- is we're really going to have to do something in one of the afternoons if we're going to get a block of time for useful foreign interaction with our community as a cross-community input for our work in this group. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Cheryl, that's helpful. Annebeth, your hand is up.

Annebeth: Thank you. Yes, I just wanted to ask (unintelligible) if he could say something about the GAC plans for this meeting. Will they have more time to discuss things (unintelligible) with the cross-community than they usually have?

((Crosstalk))

(Panos):   Can you hear me? It's (Panos) here.

Annebeth: Yes.

(Panos): Hello everybody. Unfortunately, Annebeth, I cannot answer this question because the last two weeks we've had a (unintelligible) case in (Greece). So I had some days off and I could not follow them - the operations for the GAC (in there).

And I'd - I have - I don't have any idea of GAC (unintelligible) at this moment. As soon as I have some update, I will let you know. Sorry about that.

Annebeth: Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Annebeth, and thanks (Panos). Do we have anyone from any of the other communities within the - within ICANN? I'm looking down the name - our list of names, but sometimes it's the case that - if you misplace a name and have them think they're in one community and in fact they're in another community.

Do I have anyone else that's not (AS) or ALAC or (at large) or GNSO or ccNSO -- doesn't look like it. No, good, (boy). Well, that gives everyone an idea and I suppose what it does for me is it give me some confidence that we're not alone in the GNSO in trying to find our feet still at this late stage in upcoming Meeting B.

We did, in fact, Lars and (Carlos) and I discussed the possibility of putting this CWG on the agenda for the GNSO at Meeting B. And it - the way that that would have worked, let's say, at that stage it was really just a -- put your hand up if you would like to be one of the working groups that gets focused on.

And potentially have a spot in these intensive sessions that the GNSO is running in terms of face-to-faces. And in fact, of course a number of groups put up their hands and we were one of many.

And so the GNSO agenda does not at this point have a slot for us. So with that in mind, I suppose the natural next step would be to think about the

ccNSO agenda. And could we as the ccNSO -- if the other sponsoring organization -- and (Panos), I see your hand is up -- please.

(Panos):   Yes. Sorry for taking the floor again. I just wanted to add that the GAC has a space in the working group on the graphic names. And this group will have a - they are aware of the work that is done in this group that we have now.

And so I - I'm pretty sure I - that at least the members of this group -- if not the whole GAC -- would like to have a cross-community discussion for this issue -- in other words, talking in our group now.

If this - the group (unintelligible) the graphic names have been aware and to have been notified by (Arlos) mainly -- me and other GAC members. That is for the record. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, (Panos). That's useful and indeed that's something that was not on our agenda -- apologies. There was some discussion back and forth -- largely on the staff end as to whether we could meet with the GAC working group.

They had asked to meet with us some time ago and we said we'd be, you know, we'd be very happy to discuss how we could put that onto the schedule. Lars or Bart -- can you update us on where we are with that?

Lars Hoffman: Could you repeat that -- this is Lars? Sorry, I'm having a…

Bart Boswinkel: Go ahead, Lars.

Lars Hoffman: Sure. Okay. Yes, so we have scheduled for Monday morning. I spoke to the GAC support and they proposed to (tell) on principle. And then when I first got back to them, they said, "Yes, that we don't actually yet either exactly our schedule -- it's just what looks good at the moment."

Am I then concerned that Monday would definitely work for our leadership and most of our group as well? And they have yet to get back to me. But the working assumption right now is that Monday morning will be the (cut). Thank you, (Heather).

Heather Forrest: Fantastic, thanks, Lars. So indeed that - that's in the schedule and that's not let's say to a clarity -- intention isn't that that would replace our regular meeting -- nor I anticipate that that be - that that meeting replaces any regular meeting of the GAC working group.

It bears mentioning -- Annebeth and Lars and I and (Susan Payne) -- there were a few of us from the working group -- from just cross-community working group -- that attended the GAC Working Group Meeting in Marrakesh.

And that was quite interesting because we've had some difficulty in -- let's because their meetings are closed. We've had some difficulty in following what that group is doing and where it's gotten to when it's worked -- and so that was quite useful.

So I would encourage everyone if you're able to -- once we have the details locked down into the agenda for upcoming meeting -- then we'll circulate those on list and make sure they're very clearly advertised.

I'd encourage you to attend. I found that it was one of the most useful sessions in the meetings last time in Marrakesh. The intention -- I can't say we've nailed down the agenda, but it at least in our discussions back and forth with - between staff is that the Meeting B sort of equally divided half the time.

There will be an update from us for them -- and then vice versa the other half of the time -- them updating us on their work. So with that, it promises to be a fairly useful session, so I hope you'll attend.

So that's not, let's say, the only thing we hope to achieve or the only time we plan to meet face-to-face in Helsinki. And so I supposed if we can't get into the GNSO agenda -- which it looks in keeping we likely can.

Bart, could you perhaps from a staff and a scheduling point of view, can you give us some idea as to whether we could get into the agenda for the ccNSO? And perhaps when thinking about getting to the agenda, let's stick with the theme if we can of Meeting B as a policy form as a sort of open discussion as opposed to our usual face-to-face -- our hour and a half meeting? Thanks, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, this is Bart. Say as I said in the introduction on how the ccNSO Meeting is structured -- is on Tuesday and Wednesday -- and even on Thursday afternoon. It's - there is an open slot from 3:00 to 5:00 or 3:00 to 6:00 for cross-community work.

And as I said -- and it depends a bit on the topics discussed in parallel on - during that time -- the ccNSO is looking into, say, if some of their hot topics are not on the list of the major - in the major room to organize some sessions themselves.

Say one will be definitely on the C - on the new ccNSO PDP -- and envisioned - and say one of the opportunities -- because I think to date we have, say, potentially three sessions is for this group.

And in conjunction with others -- to use that slot under the umbrella of the ccNSO for again cross-community work because I think if - say the main criteria as far as I understand from the program working group -- the ccNSO program working group -- is they should be a clear link with the interest and what the ccTLD community finds interesting -- and clearly, this is one of them.

So there is potentially an opportunity that, say, either on Tuesday or Wednesday afternoon -- depending on the others' (slot) this group -- under the umbrella and in the room of the ccNSO could organize a broader session with the broader community. Because this is definitely cross-community work.

Does that answer your question, (Heather)?

Heather Forrest: That's great, Bart -- very helpful, I think, as a starting point -- then we at least know it's possible. I wouldn't want to go down that path here having a broader discussion about what we could do with time -- there is no time to do anything with.

So I think, in fact, we do have some possibility of (time) in a room. What does everyone think? I'd like to turn it over to the floor. Would it be useful to have a broader community session and to hear others' views on the work that we've done to now?

Of course, we have our (Straw Man) and it's been circulated for (unintelligible) (Tuesday). It's been circulated amongst us and we may have discussed it with members of our respective communities, but we haven't engaged the broader public really since our informal survey.

I wonder if this fact is an opportunity to get the community more involved in our work. Does anyone have a view on that? (Unintelligible) typed into the Chat. Cheryl Langdon-Orr says, "Yes, I think a cross-community session would be useful and timely in Helsinki."

Thanks Cheryl, that is (unintelligible). Anyone else have feelings about this -- about the idea of a cross-community session as a way forward? "But we need to get it into the agenda ASAP" Cheryl says -- and I agree -- I agree.

I don't see any hands. Annebeth has typed into the Chat, "(Unintelligible) representing (Norway) in the GAC is also a member of our working group, but I think he's participating in Helsinki."

There's been some comments in the Chat about the GAC working group and (Panos) has informed that he might not be able to attend. Annebeth, your hand is up -- please.

Annebeth: Hello, this is Annebeth again. I think that it's a very good idea to try to get people from all the communities to discuss this. Because as you have said earlier, (Heather), we have had some comments, but too few.

If this is of interest to all the communities, they should be acting now and have a possibility to say what they mean in a broader discussion. If we can manage that in Helsinki, that would be very good.

So I support the idea of doing that if we can manage it in any way.

Heather Forrest: Great. Thanks, Annebeth. (Paul) (Unintelligible).

(Paul):   Thanks, (Heather). Two points -- first of all definitely agree with the idea. And Annebeth spoke specifically on our work -- the working group's work -- and particularly given we've had a bit of a dry run with the - with - or an unclear way forward with the consultation that we've done to date with the community.

I think it would be good to try to solicit more input, but also I believe the sessions should be more broadly focused to a more general discussion on -- in other words not just us talking -- but us listening as a working group as well so that we get input from those other folks that are doing work that we identified -- so specifically the geographic focus of the group within GAC.

For example, there's a lot of talk around geographic issues -- geographic names going on around the community. It would be good for everyone to get together and hear each other's views and each other's areas of activity at the moment -- both to check the scene -- but then also foster some sort of mutual understanding of where there's intersection and overlap.

So good idea -- especially if we can make it a bit broader than just our groups' work.

Heather Forrest: Great, thanks very much (Paul). I know that (Panos) has agreed in the Chat with the idea. I spoke really on (Paul)'s comments just now. In light of the fact that we have this meeting that's lined up with the GAC. And the GAC's focus - one of the major concerns all along has been - and certainly my focus -- I will wear this very clearly.

One of my concerns all along has been the multiplicity of efforts in this space. And by this space, I mean geographic (names). We have had some early dialogue early and perhaps confused dialogue -- and I suppose increasingly clear dialogue with the GAC working group.

Initially it was a sub-working group and now it's a working group of its own. As to what their scope was -- and it seems that their scope is geographic in cultural names other than country and territory names. Our scope, of course, limited by our charter-only to country and territory names used at the top level.

I still have concerns - I mean I suppose it's been argued to me that that's a bright line between those two. And I humbly and respectfully disagree. I would put all of these names in the (camp) of geographic names. And that to me says that we could in the end come up with conflicting approaches or diverging approaches to how we deal with different categories of geographic names.

So I wonder if this isn't -- and I know others have had shared concerns like this. I think it's largely been me that's been very vocal about it. But I know others have approached me in the meeting to say that they shared our concern.

And Annebeth has put a comment in the Chat to say she's concerned as well and agrees. I wonder if then this isn't an opportunity to see then the fact that we have this close community theme -- we have this Policy Development theme for Meeting B.

And rather than approach this from the perspective of country and territory names, perhaps what we do is open the floor to geographic names more broadly. And that will -- given (Paul Sinler)'s comment -- and Annebeth about let's get the community more broadly involved -- that'll certainly bring in the GAC community.

And hopefully engage the ALAC as well -- maybe Cheryl -- you'd be willing to offer some comments after Annebeth who has her hand up. Thanks.

Annebeth: Thank you (Heather). And my greatest concern based on the experience we have from the first round of new gTLDs, is that the GAC won't voice their concerns about country and territory names -- at this stage when we have the working group.

And then if we feed something into the PDP from the working group -- and the GAC afterwards woke up and to their - (use) into the PDP -- that will delay the process the same way as it did last time.

So the more we can get the GAC into the discussion at this stage, the better it is in my view.

Heather Forrest: Great, thanks Annebeth. I agree with you -- I think that's a very sensible approach. Cheryl, thank you very much for jumping in.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, (Heather) -- Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And I'm going to wear a couple of hats here -- not just the at large - let me try that again -- at large ALAC one. But also as - still because we haven't got rid of the whole thing yet.

The standing currently chair of the (GR) review working group as well. Yes, it's still alive -- scary as that may sound. Some of us have children that are practically having children that are younger than that anyway -- feels like it's gone on for eons.

It's probably a very good idea actually if we can pull it off in a way that engages all the other active analysts -- active groups that have been looking at the whole (GR) question.

It's a little bit like the use of country and territory names and it is such a hot (item) for many people. Keeps getting visited by all sorts of different factions and it might be a good idea if we can do it to get everybody together for a - more of a forum-type discussion.

That would certainly (feed) in at an appropriate time to a number of activities. But of course we can't make that happen without a great deal of coordination. So you'd need to be reaching out pretty quickly to the (leads) of the other components up to make sure they at least have a facilitator or commenter on their work to date on these things.

But certainly what I found when we recently had the public comment on our almost ancient history piece of geographic regions within ICANN is that so many new people have come into all of our communities that, you know, things -- they're back to re-litigation stage yet again.

And if we can avoid that in any way with the work we're currently doing with the use of names -- that would be excellent. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Cheryl -- very prudent and helpful comment. (Carlos), please -- your hand is up.

Carlos Raul Guttierez: Yes, (Carlos) for the record. I want to (unintelligible) to these words that Cheryl just used. We cannot forget that we have to (unintelligible) efforts going on in terms of the subsequent rounds and in terms of the right protection mechanisms on trademarks.

And we're also analyzing the competition impact of the last round which has been very positive with some community issues like cities -- but not so much with other ones. And we cannot forget that we have two ongoing IRPs against (four) decisions onto geographic-related names that I'm not going to quote here.

So I think this idea of having a wider participation in Helsinki -- Cheryl used the word "forum" would be very interesting to analyze -- to have people from each (SO) and (AC) -- and I don't know, maybe even somebody from the board.

And - or if they don't want somebody from the legal department who is dealing with our (RRPs) -- and have a frank exchange -- where do we stand? Because apart from all the difficulties of dealing with this issue of country and territory names, there is a big danger that we miss the train altogether -- and one of the other groups or efforts will start going in another direction. Thank you very much.

Heather Forrest: Thanks (Carlos). I think that's it's an interesting form -- it should follow on from Cheryl's comment about avoiding litigation and mentioning legal. I think that's a great idea.

So general support -- mind you -- I'm mindful of the fact that most of the expressions of support on this call have come from the co-chairs. And we've, you know, at a very high level discussed in our preparatory meeting.

There have been some positive comments from Cheryl -- thank you very much. I put Cheryl on the spot, admittedly. And from (Panos) and (Collin) in the Chat -- and Cheryl's made the "smiley face" for me in the Adobe Room.

Does anyone perhaps -- this is the way to do this -- sometimes I have to do this with my university students. Is there anyone that disagrees with the idea of the - having some kind of a public forum on Helsinki and using the time slot in the (CC) in the fall to do that? Giving them a second to reply -- there's a few people typing in comments.

(Unintelligible) has support - said - like - to the Chat, "I support the idea of a public forum." Let's see (unintelligible) -- they both look like they - comment -- I'll wait for (long). "Just wanted to avoid litigation." Yes, I agree.

Marvelous, well no expressions of dis-(comfort) with the idea of having a public forum. Of course, in order to do this and have it within the sector of the ccNSO, let's say our initial focus would need to be our own scope which is country and territory names.

What we can do is we can open up the floor to broader comment on our (Straw Man) proposal - or (Straw Woman) proposal on a three-letter code. I think it's probably also a good idea to lay the floor with our - or set the stage with our two-letter preliminary conclusion - two-letter code preliminary conclusion that have gotten us to this point.

And I think (Paul) makes a very interesting comment which I agree with 100% the idea that this is an opportunity for us to listen more than it is an opportunity for us to speak.

How does everyone feel about that? Is this - do you have any ideas as to who we might like -- Cheryl's giving a agreeing (pick) in the Adobe. Any ideas on who we might like to invite and how we might like to do this?

I suppose one idea could be a panel -- one idea could simply be an open forum in the style of an ICANN public forum. What are your thoughts about how can we most effectively use the time to canvas broader community views on our work? (Carlos) please.

Carlos Raul Guttierez: Yes, thank you (Heather). (Carlos) for the record. I think at least we should have - we should look outside of the GAC and GNSO, ccNSO group in terms of having eye contact with the PDP and subsequent rounds -- and the review and competition and the board or legal -- whatever is necessary.

So I think we have to open up our horizon and have them gather in the main table so we can catch their opinions or their answers like to whatever discussion starts in the forum. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, (Carlos). And that brings us to Cheryl's point which is if we want to start inviting (unintelligible) people -- or anyone we want to invite -- we need to do so sooner rather than later given that we're all starting to put our schedules for Helsinki together in a more concrete way.

Out of the queue, Annebeth a comment in the Chat -- the forum we've had before with the red and green cards moderated by (Patrick) -- wasn't that his name -- that was quite lively. I don't remember that -- do you want maybe to refresh my memory or is this something that you've done within the ccNSO? Please Annebeth, go ahead.

Annebeth: Yes and (MaryAnn) -- it's Annebeth here. No, I can't remember which meeting it was, but that it was (unintelligible) as being the NSO. It was an open meeting and it was the participants were taking in a kind of a square

which each (their) and (Patrick) - but you remember this -- we have had - I think it was several meetings.

A very good (unintelligible) walking about -- taking questions -- do you remember?

Bart Boswinkel: This is…

Annebeth: Do you remember?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes I do. I think these were the initial thoughts - I think the (Cairo) meeting --- last (Cairo) meeting was when it was done. But Cheryl knows better -- so Cheryl, you want to go ahead first?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But -- it's Cheryl for the record -- and I do not know better than (unintelligible). You know that very well indeed. However, it was in fact the very, very earliest of our cross-community efforts from a public point of view.

We were seeing the benefits of the interaction between cross-community on specific topics such as the fast track for (IDNs) at the time. And (Krista Spane), myself as Chair of ALAC -- and Chuck Gomes -- Chair of GNSO -- forced the (hand) and it was fought -- it was argued strongly -- that we should have some form of public interaction in the cross-community way on a Monday afternoon.

And we did run a couple of those. We thought they worked very well, but all sorts of other reasons and stuff got in the way in the (unintelligible). It's a type of format that purely I strongly, yes, support because it is a directive that mixes the opportunities to community speakers to put a very short piece -- comment -- to the room and each other -- allows for audience interaction as long as you've got a good facilitator and - facilitator at that stage.

There's many of them out there, but that particular one was (Patrick Sherry) because he was working with ICANN on a number of projects. But I'm sure we could find any number of highly capable -- including within our community -- facilitators.

We thought, for example, (Krista Spane), facilitate during (IGF) meetings, you know, so we've got the talent. But it does allow for a lot of community interaction. And with the use of colored cards, you can actually - what we called -- it was measuring the temperature of the room.

Of course, we'd prefer not to use that in a posed (IGF) commentary world -- so we'll have to come up with some other name if you want to use that format again.

But it allowed -- with the colored cards -- for the audience who may not feel comfortable actually getting up and calling for the microphone or standing in a microphone to agree or disagree with what was being said. And it allows a little bit of Q & A -- so the facilitator draws out the people around the table, as well as interacts with the audience -- can be done -- and there's a number of other similar formats we could explore. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Great, thank you Cheryl, Annebeth and Bart. And Annebeth, your hand is up -- is that an old hand or a new hand?

Annebeth: No it's a new hand. It's Annebeth again. Did - why I suggested this was that I remember it -- as Cheryl said -- that some people discussed and then pick up the temperature from the room for those who didn't necessarily dare or wanted to say something specifically.

And what we talked about in the co-chair call we had last week was that what we would like to do was to get other people and those sitting in the working group also to get a feeling of what's going on and get their meaning on these issues.

So it might be an idea -- but I'm not sure how it could be arranged -- but I remember it best with - yes, it was positive -- it was a positive feeling in the room when we had that kind of discussion.

Heather Forrest: (Point) Annebeth. What - so we've put up ideas now about a facilitated discussion. We - which I think is helpful in a sense that if we are truly there to listen, then it would be beneficial to us not to have to mediate or to facilitate sessions.

I suppose one question in our agenda -- (Yoka), if you can note as well we had written up a little bit earlier -- who do we want to invite. And one of the other suggestions about who to invite was the folks from the leadership (unintelligible) of the subsequent procedures PDP.

I agree with (Carlos) -- that that's a very sensible approach and here's why I say that. The subsequent procedures PDP has as its starting point -- and as its charter -- the consideration of all of the policy in the Applicant Guide Book from - or essentially of the policies that led to the Applicant Guide Book -- so the GNSO recommendations and procedures.

And of course Module 2 includes the provisions on geographic names. And it's very clearly within the scope of the subsequent procedures PDP and the leadership of that PDP is quite aware of that fact -- that our work will ultimately feed into and be lead the work of the GAC working group -- will ultimately feed into the subsequent procedures PDP's work.

It's part of their charter and part of their mandate in reviewing the condition of where we go in terms of modifying or making any recommendations in guidelines. So I agree that its' an important thing if subsequent procedures is involved.

The question I suppose that I have is we need to think about the form that this thing takes. If it takes a form of a round table whereby we invite particular people, we need to have a backup plan if those particular people are not able to attend.

For example, if we try and invite a board member -- a member of the ICANN legal staff -- someone from subsequent procedures or a multiple someone from subsequent procedures -- someone from each community. If those people are not able to attend -- and if they have particular expertise and there's no replacement for them -- then that could be a challenge for us.

Whereas if we have an open floor similar to what Annebeth and Bart and Cheryl have described, then we're less-dependent on particular individuals in the room. But there's a more of a risk that without a personal invitation, if you like, we lose key players in the room. So I guess my question to everyone open to the floor is -- how do we get the people in the room that we need in the room?

Whatever form it takes -- how do we get the people we need in the room? Any thoughts on that?

Bart Boswinkel: I have a - this is Bart. May I address a couple of points?

Heather Forrest: Please, Bart, go right ahead.

Bart Boswinkel: First of all, say just going back to the cards, etcetera -- ever since (Patrick Sherry) introduced it, we've been using them within the ccNSO on Wednesday afternoon during panel discussions. And so say from an organizing these panel discussions -- say within the ccNSO -- there is some experience in doing it in different ways.

Normally, we - if we do have panel discussions, we have first of all an introduction and a bit of a round table discussion -- and a facilitator -- so you set the scope and the scene of the discussion by people you invite.

And in this case, you could even - and that's some of the things we've introduced in the past is work with many panels. So two or three people discussing a topic for ten minutes and then move over to another topic.

They all sit in front and then at the end you have a facilitator managing that process and asking the right questions and introduce and ask people from the audience to contribute to that discussion. And you have the red and green and I think the yellow cards now to - so for the audience to participate, yes, as well in the questions -- and to hear their opinions around the topic.

So the way we - that's organized is normally we first of all like to - is looking at the objective of the meeting itself -- what do you want to get out of it -- or what do you want to hear. And based on that, you start inviting people and because that makes it easier to invite people.

Say this will be your contribution and you can add to any other topic, but present from that perspective and participate from that perspective. So cut a long story short, may I suggest that staff prepare something for you as co-chairs and to - this week -- early next week -- and to share that later on with the group as a way forward because then you have a strong format to deal and to organize a kind of forum panel discussion with interaction? Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Bart, thank you. I think that would be extremely helpful if you and (Yoka) and Lars are willing to do that -- put together some idea of how this might look. I think that would be very helpful.

And I suppose -- given that we haven't had any objection on this call -- Bart, if you're able to put some sort of pencil mark on that space -- or if you can

make the request to whomever it needs to be made -- that we potentially might want to put our hands on that time that the ccNSO has.

Then that would also be very helpful because I'm mindful of the fact that if we don't have a room or we don't have time, then all of this is for naught. So the sooner we can…

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Heather Forrest: …maybe put our hand down for that -- that would be great. Yes?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and adding to that -- say if we got - if - say if it works and it will be in the ccNSO room, say you stuck with the format of that room. Say there will not be time enough to change the shape of it. Because especially if it's on Tuesday afternoon -- say the next morning the ccNSO gets in again and there will be some other meetings organized by the ccNSO.

So - but most of the time they're reasonably large -- they take in about 120, 150 people -- so that should be enough.

Heather Forrest: Great, Bart, thank you very much. And Annebeth says, "So then it would be a panel?" I think Annebeth, the idea is that staff will (play) and think about what is possible and come back to us with some recommendations.

One of the things that I think - that I was hoping maybe we could achieve today -- and in light of the time -- we have three minutes left -- we won't be able to do in a serious way. Is to make some suggestions as to who we'd like to see receive a very specific invitation to whatever this format is.

We've had the recommendation for the ICANN board and I'd say at least one member of the board would be very helpful. Someone from ICANN legal, I think, would be very helpful in light of the comments about wanting to avoid litigation going forward.

The leadership of the subsequent procedures PDP -- I've made comments on that. Can we ask the working group members to mail us suggestions out of this? I think that's the best way forward given the time.

I encourage you all -- I know it's hard in the lead up to Helsinki -- there's a million emails a day and we're all trying to scramble to get ready. But in light of the fact that we don't have that much time between now and Helsinki -- and we want to try and get into these people's agendas as soon as possible -- perhaps this week -- I'm conscious, but for most of you it's still Monday here -- for (Paul) and Cheryl and I -- it's Tuesday already.

Let's try and make this a task for this week. If you can post to the list if you have suggestions for particular people that you think - or particular roles -- it doesn't have to be an individual's name -- but perhaps, you know, someone's function -- that you think would be helpful to invite to this -- that would be very helpful.

So let's make that our task to do all of this -- this week -- by Friday. And, Bart, then, would you -- or Bart, Lars and (Yoka), I guess, can you work together to decide how best to plug that into the proposal -- the sketch that Bart -- you're thinking of doing -- is that - can those names get sort of plugged into your thinking as well -- will that work?

Joke Braeken: Absolutely, it would work for me.

Heather Forrest: Yes, great, thank you, (Yoka), that's wonderful. Wonderful, we're at the hour. We have reached our allotted time. Any further comments, concerns, questions? No?

Wonderful, as always -- thank you very, very much to Bart, (Yoka), Lars and Terri -- our fantastic staff. Super useful -- thanks for your input everyone and

we will be together for our next meeting in two weeks' time -- and we all have this "to do" list item for this Friday.

Please put to the list your suggestions for whom we might want to invite to this meeting that's shaping up for Helsinki. Thanks very much everyone. Have a wonderful day -- all the best to you -- talk to you next time. Bye.

Woman 1:   Thanks (Heather).

Man 1:   Thanks (Heather). Thanks all. Bye-bye.

Terri Agnew: Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

                Operator (Kim), if you could please stop all recording.

Coordinator: Recordings are ended.

                                    END