ICANN
Transcript
CWG on Country and Territory Names as TLD's
Monday, 23 May 2016 at 21:00 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-23may16-en.mp3

Attendees:

ccNSO:
Ron Sherwood, .vi
Sebastien Pensis, .eu
Young-eum Lee, .kr

GNSO
Heather Forrest, IPC (co-Chair)
Carlos Raul Guttierez, NPOC (co-Chair)
Griffin Barnett, IPC
 Maxim Alzoba, NTAG (GNSO)
Alexander Schubert, RySG

ALAC:
Cheryl Langdon-Orr

Expert:
Jaap Akkerhuis (ISO 3166 Expert)

Apologies:
Susan Payne, NTAG (GNSO)
Laura Hutchinson, .uk (ccNSO)
Colin O'Brien, IPC
Annebeth Lange, .no
Panagiotis Papaspiliopoulos
Sanna Sahlman, .fi

ICANN staff:
Marika Konings

Lars Hoffman
Brian Aitchison
Bart Boswinkel
Joke Braeken
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Excuse me, the recording has been started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much, (Jake). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody, and welcome to the CWG UCTN call on the 23rd of May, 2016. On the call today we have Alexander Schubert, Carlos Raul Gutierrez, Heather Forrest, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maxim Alzoba, Ron Sherwood, Sebastien Pensis and Griffin Barnett. We received apologies from Annebeth Lange, Susan Payne, Colin O'Brian, Sanna Sahlman, Laura Hutchinson and Panagiotis Papaspiliopoulos.

From staff we have Bart Boswinkel, Marika Konings, Lars Hoffman, Brian Aitchison, Joke Braeken and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Nathalie.

((Crosstalk))

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Thank you very much. A few conversations over the last few days and in view that we are finishing the arrangements for our face to face meetings in Helsinki, we think it's appropriate to concentrate on those sessions because we want to - we expect to have a good discussion. We want to discuss with all of you what the best framework for those meetings should be.

So if there is agreement to start right away with the Helsinki meetings before we continue with the agenda, I would like to give the mic to Bart Boswinkel, who has prepared a very interesting way to analyze what is coming up to us. So, Bart, would you please.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Carlos. And welcome, so I see somebody else is joining. What you see in front of you is what I've just sent by email to the list. It's an overview of some discussion points for a, I would say a forum cross community forum on the auspices of the ccNSO on Wednesday afternoon in the ccNSO room.

The ccNSO Program Working Group agreed to host that meeting. And it will be, as I said in Wednesday from quarter past three until quarter to five in the ccNSO meeting room. So that's the session I'm going to focus on.

What is still up in the air is a meeting between the working group's cochairs of the working group and the GAC working group. If that continues that will be on Tuesday right after lunch. But so we'll keep you abreast of these events when we know more. And that's, again, up to the working group.

So let me take you through the mind map you see in front of you and on the screen. As you may recall, we had a brief discussion on the previous call around the possible session discussing a little bit - make it a little bit more broader than just the CTN but really go into the need for a harmonized approach. And one of the goals of this working group is to assess the feasibility of such an approach and to share some of the findings to date and the issues the working group is facing - not just this working group but also with respect to geographic names and some other issues and to seek - and inform the broader community who is interested in this topic and, yes, who wants to attend it.

So first I'll want to go through the goal or potential goal of the session. And please provide your feedback if you agree or disagree or want to see a

change, then go into potential topics because I think the topics at least, yes, they are the - they are the - they put the pace on the session, then discuss the format with you and then go into the organization so and that's more that, say, agree on format, identify potential presenters, etcetera, so that's more the logistical side of it.

So let me go into the goal of the session itself first is say based on the discussion on the last call and after consulting with cochairs it looks like, say, one of the goals of the working group is to present an overview of the initiative of the geo names in general and more specifically on what this working group is doing and what it's trying to achieve for the broader community.

And one of the goals, as I said, to achieve, is assess and that's the first step in the process is assess the feasibility of a harmonized approach. And if you talk about assess the feasibility of a harmonized approach it's probably what's needed is first to understand what such a harmonized approach is, explain this to the community, who are potential interested parties in such a harmonized approach and most importantly probably, because I'm a pragmatic person, is why is it needed? If you can't answer these three questions then why do we want - or why does the working group want to assess the feasibility.

So that's probably a good direction of travel outcome for such a session that the working group has a clear answer but also that the community understands the need for such an approach and where the working group is at and what is the difference between this working group and the geo names working group. So that's one.

Any questions regarding the goal or comments before I move forward?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Please, let's stop for a second here and ask for hands and questions. I see Heather - please go ahead, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Carlos. And thank you very much, Bart. The thing I particularly like about the way you've set out the goals here is it gives us an opportunity to make a note of the other activities that are happening within ICANN, that are potentially overlapping with our scope and I think it's a good reminder, it's a good way (unintelligible) the community about that point and concerns that we might have. So I think that's brilliant, thanks.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you. Alexander, you have your hand up.

((Crosstalk))

Alexander Schubert: Yes, hi. It's Alexander. For those who don't know me I am the co-founder of the (unintelligible) we came to ICANN in 2005 - (Dirk) and me and we said we wanted (unintelligible) and eventually after many years it worked out.

So I have dealt with geo-based domains since the end of 2004. And I am in the process of creating an applicant for the second round 2019-2020. And my idea is why don't we put out a kind of like an RFP, let people who are willing to step forward would say if - would - show their project for the second round for geo top level domain. And why are most applicants for generic keyword try to hide their application in order to avoid any competition. Those who need the letter of non-objection of the relevant government authority are usually out pretty early because they need to get all the endorsement from different stakeholders to get the endorsement from the government authority.

So who knows, maybe there are already a few entities out there who would share with us what string they would apply for that could help us to see what the demand is out there. Could also be it's a little bit too early because, after all, it's 2016 and the next round will be only '19-'20.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Alexander. I think, say, if you look at the - this could be part of the topics. Maybe we should revisit it as we discuss the topics. But at this stage,

and that's the core of this working group, is say is to come up and propose a harmonized work. And I think if you look at what you're suggesting is - and that's up for discussion of course by the working group it should be - it's more part of the - yes, either say the - a harmonized approach, yes or no. and secondly, say, it's one of the potential topics for discussion if you look at the, say, either at this stage or in the future. Does that address your point?

Alexander Schubert: Yes, to a degree. I mean, what we have observed in the first round, the 2012 round, was that in certain niches, for example the community TLDs, there was a lot of theory about how, for example, community TLDs should be processed, and once they all applied it came to the light of day that, yes, the route were not really realistic and a lot of problems occurred.

So as - it's probably too early, and you're right, maybe it's not a topic for this working group. But if there would be entities who would step forward, and say what they want to do it might be tremendously helpful to include their wishes and needs.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I see that it's included in the notes so I think it's one of the - say, it's definitely a topic that this working group could take into account and take note of. Any other remarks? I see three hands up. Carlos.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes…

((Crosstalk))

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: …thank you, Bart. I want to react to Alexander and tell you that one of our biggest - not worries but responsibilities is to keep this discussion connected with other ongoing discussions and you already mentioned two of them. And you can be sure that the reason we want to have a very open conversation in Helsinki is that we keep the other processes informed or we might want to have closer discussions with the other processes.

You can be sure that the PDP on the subsequent rounds is taking note of everything you mentioned, actually we were discussing today a questionnaire that we're going to send out hopefully next week where we discuss some of the questions that you asked. And so there is this very big effort to cover that area.

You also mentioned the issue of competition and there is a review that is also looking at not only at successful applications but also failed applications and applications that didn't complete the process. So I think we have to focus right now on the previous work on this group that was very limited, only two letter codes and three letter codes. I think Bart made a very heroic gesture to put geo names in the title. I like it because we will discuss as a next step under topics, this very interesting third line that he has, geo names versus country and territory names. So there is no more comments on that I think we're exactly at the point where Bart can jump to the next group under topics.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay, thank you, Carlos. So if, say, you agree on the goals, then the real question is how to ensure it will be a lively session and that the goals will be met. So the suggestion again based on the conversations some time ago and after consulting with the cochairs, is to first, provide a little bit what is called - say what I've called a general lay of the land both with respect to say what it means to have a harmonized approach and fragmented approach and that's probably what we currently have, a fragmented approach and the most - and say that's part of the study group report etcetera.

An interesting sideline is issues that, say, or concerns that SSAC - the SSAC have raised and maybe Jaap can either include it in the chat or allude to it on this call. And so that's the general lay of the land. And, Jaap, I will get back to you in that way.

Say, of course one of the core issues is the difference between three letter codes, the core of - or the difference in opinion around how to treat the three letter codes. And it's probably a very good illustration of the difficulties of

finding what is a harmonized approach or having a fragmented approach as we currently have. And then a little bit around the difference between geo names on the one hand side, and country and territory names and this is more around who are the interested parties in, say, in this discussion.

You could see that the geo names is probably more of interest for the GAC and the people interested in new gTLDs and the different stakeholder groups around it and which would exclude say - or not in principle but almost by definition the ccTLDs who have a very deep concern around the use of country and territory names. And that was the kick off of this meeting.

Secondly, and that's more looking into the future, these are, as I said, just suggestions, more looking into the future is even if we could resolve or even if the group could resolve the issues around three letter codes, it will be a quite - this is just the - yes, the second stepping stone until the real issues around the full country names, whether in the long form or short form, as they are listed in the different standards.

So what I suggest is that based on, say, at least the work at this session, these three different topics are highlighted, addressed and one way or the other come back in the format; some with a bit more - bit more explicit than the others but at least it gives a very full understanding of what is happening.

Any questions, suggestions, comments around the topics? And, Heather, I see your question around timing so maybe start with your question, Heather, around the timing and then go into the topics.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Bart. Apologies, my topic probably fits better in format maybe. It's just occurred to me this schedule is a moving target for Helsinki. And it looks like we have some problems in terms of overlap with the precise timing that we're going to bump up against the RPM GNSO RPM PDP Working Group.

And I wonder if that creates issues - it certainly creates issues in terms of - in terms of we're going to lose some of the people that we need in the room. I'm the Council liaison for that PDP as well. And I wonder if we're going to get our knuckles wrapped for overlapping with meetings. I wonder if there's anybody on staff that has a sense of, yes, what we need to bear in mind in terms of timing. Thanks.

Bart Boswinkel: Any other additional questions? Otherwise I can answer it because, say, I was, say, from staff side on the, say, organizing this session under auspices of the program working group.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: I see Alexander has his hand up. I don't know.

Bart Boswinkel: Alexander?

Alexander Schubert: I'm sorry but the last two - I didn't hear anything. I don't know whether it was…

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

Alexander Schubert: What was the question?

Bart Boswinkel: No, you got your hand up. Do you have any issue or…

Alexander Schubert: That's the - I'm sorry…

Bart Boswinkel: That's an old hand.

Alexander Schubert: …put it down. Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, okay thank you. If there is nobody - so let me explain a little bit why at least this was scheduled on Wednesday afternoon from a ccNSO perspective. On, say, there are two alternatives for this - there were two

alternatives for this session. One was the Tuesday afternoon and the other one was the Wednesday afternoon.

The Tuesday afternoon the ccNSO has a meeting with the GAC on quarter past three until quarter past four and is scheduling another session around the operational planning process later in the afternoon. And that's due to internal ccNSO reasons.

So the only slot available were on Wednesday afternoon for this working group. And we realized there is, say, there are parallel sessions - cross community parallel sessions on, say, Tuesday and Wednesday as there are parallel sessions on Monday, vis-à-vis for example Tech Day.

So knowing there are a parallel sessions, at least from a ccNSO perspective, this was the best solution. Say, the alternative would be putting this later in the afternoon on Wednesday but then you're opposed to another cross community working group relating to the Cross Community Working Group Square or the Principles of Cross Community Working Group in which the ccNSO is participating heavily.

So that's the reason why it was scheduled on Wednesday afternoon fully realizing there are parallel sessions in which, say, that people have to make a choice between the different sessions. And one of the considerations there was, again, this session around the use of country and territory names is getting a lot of traction right now in the ccTLD community as well and they are not so much into some of the other sessions on Tuesday and Wednesday. So that was one of the reasons, again, to organize a kind of cross community - or allowing for a cross community working group session under the auspices of the ccNSO on Wednesday afternoon.

Carlos, I see your hand up.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes, thank you, Bart. This is Carlos. Very important, so far in the previous meeting these cross working group was only part of the agenda of the one-hour meeting with the ccNSO. So we always came rather short. This is really a GNSO ccNSO working group, not a wide cross community working group so I really appreciate your proposal to spend a little bit more time, a full session with the ccNSO.

And I think our purpose is really not just to report between the ccNSO and the GNSO but really have a good discussion between the two chartering organizations so I think it's very important that we have this quality time in a framework between the GNSO and the ccNSO type of meetings. And I really like the idea of having one and a half hours in this framework. Even if it's in the afternoon, even if some people have conflict, I think we really want to focus the discussion right now because we will have to take some decisions what the path forward is. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Say, maybe in addition, say, this meeting is definitely not limited to GNSO and ccNSO or ccTLDs and gTLDs and GNSO stakeholder groups. It is others are will and are all invited to attend this meeting. And fully realizing it may cause some conflicts but at least there is a clear intention for making this as cross community as possible hence also the inclusion of the SSAC topic.

Marika, you have your hand up.

Marika Konings: Yes, hi. This is Marika. I definitely don't mean to but in but listening to the conversation on the Meeting B schedule, I just wanted to note that as far as I understand it, the idea is at least the cross community sessions that are scheduled in that afternoon are, as far as possible, (reflect) the time and definitely shouldn't overlap with sessions that are also intended to target the same audience.

As that I think is one of the main objectives of the Meeting B format to avoid these clashes that we see in the normal meeting format to really allow for this

kind of open discussion with everyone that has an interest in that topic present and here we're clearly looking at, you know, targeting at the same time communities that have an interest in both those topics.

One point - and I will need to check back, I think as you all know, I think all the SOs and ACs were asked to select what they considered, you know, their highest priority for such cross community conversations and I know this was one of the topics I think was on the list. But I think it was grouped together with the new gTLD PDP as kind of a topic belonging in that same kind of realm of conversation.

So, and again I'm thinking out loud here, and I don't know if that is indeed something that could even be considered. But whether this could be a sub-topic maybe as part of that cross community session, which I believe is scheduled on Tuesday I want to say, but I'm not 100% sure of that. And maybe that is another way of, indeed, getting that platform of, you know, broad community participation and getting this issues on the agenda and having some conversation around it.

Or alternatively, check in to see whether there are any slots that are expected to free up or maybe need less time to see if there's a possibility to do anything like that.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Marika. Any comments? No? Okay…

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: I think you should go ahead, but I take note that both Alexander and Marika have shown that if we don't move fast we will end up being a sub-segment of the subsequent rounds so we better proceed with this discussion right now. I take note of the comments part. Please, go ahead.

Bart Boswinkel: So go back to the topics discussion you mean? Or you want to address this procedure point…

((Crosstalk))

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes, no let's go forward on the format please.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Let's go to your next segment.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, okay. So let's go back to the topics point. Is there, say, as I explained and maybe I don't know, Jaap, if you want to type in, say, the issue of concern from the SSAC or want to speak on the call about it. But are there any questions, remarks around the topics as I've listed here? Because that was the initial part.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Well I hope I can say some…

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, go ahead, Jaap.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Okay. I'm - I had a lot of (unintelligible) problems earlier so wasn't sure. The SSAC is looking at the whole names schedule from kind of a helicopter view because we - there are so many people claiming to do - having a say in a top level domains. And part of the discussion is whether the story about dotOnion, I don't know whether anybody knows about it. But that's where people claim to have top level domain to be reserved because they are using domain name space that don't really using it for the DNS protocol.

And so the rest of the world should reserve that as a top level domain and it's known as dotOnion because that's what they want. So basically it will - the IETF will forbid ICANN to ever release the top level domain, dotOnion. So that's just one aspect.

If you look to that more and more than you see that there are other sources for domain names with people saying which are used. One of them is the ISO

3166 list. The IETF has said the list refers - (unintelligible) basic problem that none of these groups are talking to each other and everybody has his own policies and this is habit of picking out just the - what we just call (capitalia) model, meaning just pick out stuck you want and just you ignore what's done by (it).

One of the things you - I see in this discussion is that the three letter codes - and I assume people mean the three letter codes as defined by ISO 3166 - and geographic names, these are completely unrelated as far as 3166 is concerned - ISO is concerned. But there's still using geographic names. And (unintelligible) if they are the same things. And, you know, only generates confusion. And so SSAC is actually looking now trying to come out with studying where - who is doing what and what is actually relevant.

The same is - geographic names are a specifically interesting part of that. If you consider that the whole ISO 3166 has nothing to do with geographic, it's only cause to do information Internet, information exchange in various fields. And by accident of the Internet. And but what people are worried about geographic names are really discuss that for what I would call administrative entities.

And so that's why the fact that ISO 3166 isn't even mentioned dotAmazon or Patagonia or all these areas which are super-national. And so one of the things SSAC is looking at is what is actually the complete fields and what's happening there. So that's - might be - so that's where we're looking at and there are no resolves yet at all. But it might be worth to at least dialogue or, I mean, since we're all in - trying to talk to each other to have some conversation about what's going on there.

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Jaap. I think, say, are there any questions for Jaap? I think, say, based on this it's, say, really puts the - or, yes, the feasibility, etcetera of a

harmonized approach and what is meant by it, and, say, in a broader context. Are there questions relating to the topics? No? Then I would like to go into the format if you agree, Carlos.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Of course.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Okay well now this is more the practicalities of it. Say, how do we bring these different topics and how do we engage the audience in the different topics. First I think, say, because this is relatively complicated we should ask and depending on, say, the emphasis, etcetera, on the different topics, what is the, say, present at least the overview of the issues for those who are interested but not very aware of it.

It shouldn't take too much time but at least they should know and understand a little bit of the issues that are discussed by the different communities. So and then flowing from that, and this is just the experience from the, say, the panel discussions different, say, probably more the dialogues the ccNSO has organized until now on Wednesday afternoon, they are open discussions, no clear direction of - no specific outcome needed but it's more to, yes, solicit the views of the community present is discussions or one or two or three core issues by some - by very small panels, that's one or two people, one opposed and the other in favor of a certain approach.

Have a discussion and then engage the community in such a discussion. And these panels should take no more than 10-15 minutes. That's why we call them, say, at the time as a pun to speed dating, speed panels. In order to do this, you need to identify core topics and you need to identify core presenters. And you want to have a bit of a moderated discussion in order to allow the communities to participate.

And then the basic idea at least, and this is, again, copied from these meetings in ccNSO format, is that you start sensing the temperature of the room or a few specific questions and, again, this is moderated after the

discussion so it's per topic a brief discussion on very - in high speed. And then engage the community as much as possible by asking them specific questions and then sense the temperature of the room around these specific topics where they stand.

Is there any questions around this format or do you think you want another format, other suggestions? Carlos, over to you.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes, thank you Bart. Here really we want the whole group of participants to think aloud. I mean, Alexander made a point at the beginning of some new ideas like a second national ccTLD for Germany. And we have faced other moments in the discussion where some people - some countries said no way three letter codes, the other one said yes, want three letter codes but approved by the government.

Here we really want to hear your ideas what kind of conflicts call them, let's face them, you want to present. And we want active participation. If you can come up with some ideas. I want these point to be discussed in that session and write a sentence or two on that and suggest who might present your case or who is opposed to your case. We would like to drive this format to see where the friction is and try to capture the reaction of the people. So really this is open for the group to develop these issues to bring into the format.

Bart Boswinkel: Alexander.

Alexander Schubert: So if I understood you right, you are looking for someone who would explain their project as an example so that it could be discussed as an example.

Bart Boswinkel: It's…

((Crosstalk))

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: We would like to discuss this in this group, Alexander, maybe not in the session but before we go into the session we would like to have those ideas discussed between this call and next call.

Alexander Schubert: Okay. Well I'm happy to - I'm probably not going to discuss the project that I'm just now starting. But I have an kind of a case that is very similar, yet not three letter, it's four letter. So I could chair a four-letter case that is almost identical. In my case it's a three-letter geo name that is also a country code.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Thank you. Say, Carlos, what I'm looking for feedback from this group at this stage as well is, say, if this type of set up to discuss the topics is acceptable would that work for this group to get - to achieve the goals because, say, you can do it differently as well. You can have a very broad panel discussion or just presentations and ask questions to the audience. But say the experience we have within the ccNSO organizing these different types of sessions is - this is a very nice format to discuss different topics relatively quickly, relatively in depth and engage the community because I think that's what the working group wanted.

Heather, I see your hand up.

Heather Forrest: Bart, thank you. I think the format is great for capturing (unintelligible). As you say, there's a number of ways to go about doing this but I think this is a pretty good approach. What I would like to see us do is have a bit more of a brainstorm on whether we're able to continue with the time slot that's been suggested given the fact that you're going to miss a number of GNSO people. It might just be ccNSO people in the room in which case, you know, it'd be an effective discussion for the ccNSO but that's not what's intended.

And to the extent that we can seize this time that we've apparently been allotted or at least we're on the agenda in subsequent procedures I guess we need to liaise with the staff that's working on their format and see how we can make this work in there. Thanks.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you. Say, may I suggest that we get back to the working group on this one and how to sort this because, say, from - wearing my CC hat, I do have other concerns if, say, if it's going to be fully in the - say, the consecutive rounds knowing that a lot of people are not interested in that. And say, this way you will have 90 minutes instead of maybe 10 or 15. But that's…

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: …very quickly. I take the point but we know a number of us, you know, I hadn't realized this overlapped with RPMs and (unintelligible) folks that we need in the room are going to include some of the people in RPMs. Yes, I just am worried (unintelligible) have a sick feeling in the stomach that that Meeting B is going to be (unintelligible).

The risk that we have is we're going to have - the whole point of Meeting B is we're supposed to avoid overlaps and we have an overlap and we're all frustrated and we say we've put this forward as a topic in the GNSO as a standalone topic and that's what kind of spurred this off thinking about can we see ccNSO time. And here we are with an overlap. So I don't know how we best achieve this. I'd love to have the 90 minutes but if we're going to get 90 minutes and not enough people in the room then I guess that's a challenge.

Like, you know, either way we can go ahead with this in the proposed time and then there's just a risk that it's a, you know, it's a great discussion for the ccNSO and a number of us are going to be sorry to miss it. So I guess we just have to see how we go. Thanks.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, we'll see and as I suggested, let's take this first off time and let's get back by this say relatively quickly because until now it's not been scheduled officially in the sense it is not included in the overall schedule yet. It needs to be done by Wednesday. So we need to reach conclusions on this topic by Wednesday.

No further comments regarding the format, let's go into the final bit around the organization. And this is what we've been discussing to a certain extent is so as I said, the slot is available on Wednesday on the auspices of the ccNSO. As - and let me be very clear, it will - if it's going to be organized this way it will be organized as a cross community forum on Wednesday afternoon because it's during the blocks of cross community sessions.

I think in general based on the discussions now so that's open still for discussion over the next couple of days that we need to, say, that this working group at least the people who are on the call, agree on the format. The - so the next step would be to identify the core topics that need to be organized, a session chair, moderators, presenters and the speed panelists.

And so that's once, say, we reach agreement on the timing etcetera, we need to start identifying so the core topic session chairs, moderators, presenters and speed panelists, and then the next step is approaching the presenter and the panelists, etcetera. But say, based on, say, the discussion what I've, say, listened and the feedback until now, say, the real first question is whether the working group wants to continue to do this under auspices on Wednesday afternoon or whether it will be the 10 minutes on Tuesday.

Secondly, if that's - if we continue then we need to start identifying the core topics and the logistic - and the other logistical aspects of the session so identify the people. That's all I had to say regarding the bit around the organization at this stage.

Questions, remarks?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Okay we have no questions right now but we really encourage the people in the group to come back to the list if they have comments between now and Wednesday, if I understood it right, Bart, we have to close and confirm on Wednesday is that right?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, that's regarding whether, and that's the core question, say the offer is there that on Wednesday afternoon on the auspices of the ccNSO we organize a kind of forum around the topics we just presented. Unfortunately I can't do, say, we can't do - and that was discussed by the ccNSO, do it another way. And on Wednesday we need to submit, say, the reservations to ICANN and then we will be announced and included in the full schedule as well. So that's for Wednesday.

Once this working group agrees or disagrees, say disagrees, then it makes our lives easier, but once it agrees then we need to start working on the topics, session chair, etcetera. So the first real, real big question is around the timing of the session and whether to really make it - turn this into a cross community forum. So that needs to be done by Wednesday.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Thank you, Bart. Yes. Bart, I don't know exactly who is the liaison of the ccNSO to the PDP on the subsequent rounds. But we also have to talk with them. We have a long session in the GNSO Council on the subsequent rounds, and of course this issue will raise - will be raised in a shorter time period but certainly will be discussed in one of the mornings.

So I will talk to Avri or Jeff or write a note and copy you, Bart, so we can also coordinate with them and see what kind of time they want to spend on this in their own meeting and if they will also support us in the proposed timeframe and proposed format. So…

Bart Boswinkel: That's okay. Say just for - in response to your question, to my knowledge there is no ccNSO liaison to the subsequent rounds.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Another good point to (unintelligible). I'll designate you, Bart, for the time being. So we have here the agenda, let me come back, so if there is no other (unintelligible) Helsinki meeting if somebody wants to comment on the Helsinki meeting or should we move forward? Let's move forward and

sorry for taking almost all of the call on the plan for Helsinki but I will ask if there are other issues somebody wants to raise.

You must be tired from so many calls this Monday. Bart, do you have any comments or…

Bart Boswinkel: No, I think, say, the real issue is around the timing. That's the first and that needs to be resolved first before moving forward, and once that's done we can start filling this in if still needed.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Okay if that's the case and nobody has comments we will report on the list by next Wednesday where do we stand and we have four minutes to spare and if nobody wants to use them I give them back to the community.

Heather Forrest: Excellent. Thanks, Carlos.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, all and bye-bye.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, bye.

((Crosstalk))

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: …the nice picture, Bart.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Jake), this concludes today's call. You may now stop the recordings.

END