ICANN Transcription
CWG on Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs
Monday, 17 October 2016 at 2100 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of CWG on Use of Country And Territory Names as TLDs on the Monday, 17 October 2016 at 21:00 UTC. 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. Attendance may be also found at:
https://community.icann.org/x/_g_4Aw
The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ctn-17oct16-en.mp3

Michelle DeSmyter: Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the CWG on Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs meeting on the 17th of October at 2100 UTC.

On the call today we do have Susan Payne, Grigori Saghyan, Milagros Castanon, Heather Forrest, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alexander Schubert, Nigel Cassimire, Timo Vohmar, Griffin Barnett, Sebastien Pensis, Carlos Raul Gutierrez and Annebeth Lange and Jaap Akkerhuis.

((Crosstalk))

Michelle DeSmyter: We do have no apologies. From staff we have Bart Boswinkel, Steve Chan, Joke Braeken, Emily Barabas, Maria Otanes and myself, Michelle DeSmyter.

As a reminder please state your name before speaking transcription purposes. And I'll turn the call over to Heather Forrest. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thank you very much for starting us off on our call. And, Michelle, I noticed that Carlos has just typed into the chat I think he can hear us. Good and you're about to give him a ring so that's great. And Carlos, hopefully you can hear us on Adobe, but we will connect you so that we can hear you. And I notice we have Annebeth Lange as well from the ccNSO side. Unfortunately we have apologies from Paul Szyndler, our fourth cochairs who's unable to be with us today.

So thank you very much, everyone, for joining the call today. And we have our agenda in the right hand side of the Adobe room. For those who are on Adobe. For those who aren't I'll try and let you know where we are with things.

The first thing that we have to discuss today is the progress report. Now this group has two documents outstanding. One is the progress report and the other is a - our more substantive report, our draft report, our straw man report if you like. And the document that you see in front of us is the progress report. It's the shorter on the two documents if that's the way to remember it.

This is a practice that we've had for the life of this CWG which is reporting back to the community to let them know where we are in relation to our work now. We've had some time - we've probably gone two rounds with this document and not had much more by way of commentary to it or changes to it. I think that's probably a reflection of two things. One, we're rapidly advancing towards a face to face meeting and we're all quite busy with that sort of thing. And two, this document is, I think, largely uncontroversial except for when it comes to the end of the document and our potential recommendations.

There has been quite a bit of discussion on the list. I say quite a bit of discussion, perhaps not as much maybe as there could be, but there has been some discussion around the recommendations and indeed you'll see -

you're free to scroll with the document on the screen, as Bart has noted, got to Page 5 you'll see that there is a fair bit of track change there in this document in terms of where the recommendation sits.

I don't think that it's helpful in light of the timing. It is the 18th of October and I think many of us will be getting on planes to Hyderabad in two weeks' time. So I don't think that it's helpful to try to do another round of comment within ourselves before Hyderabad but what - let's say ideally we'd like to be able to do is finalize this document so that it can be utilized in Hyderabad so that it can go back to our SOs and ACs and other SOs and ACs for their input. And I see Cheryl has given a green tick in the Adobe room. Thank you, Cheryl.

What I suggest that we do, and then I'll open the floor, is this is my straw man suggestion if you like, is to the extent that we still have disagreement in some of these recommendations what we could do is put them into brackets and signal to the community that we are discussing them, that they are under discussion, that they are not yet determined perhaps even add a line, add a sentence there in the top of the paragraph that starts with Recommendations and say, these are the recommendations that we're discussing. We haven't yet come to conclusions but we could then take input from our respective SOs and ACs.

Bart, I see your hand's up. Go right ahead.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, thank you, Heather. Just say to be very clear, say, the reason why you see recommendation as highlighted, say, in four weeks ago that was Recommendation 3 as well. Two weeks ago it was Recommendation 2. So 1 and 2 were adopted unanimously on the call four weeks ago. So the only discussion is around Recommendation 2. So effectively Recommendation 3 and Recommendation 1 were noncontroversial. So the whole discussion…

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: …is around Recommendation 2 and then Alternative A, Alternative B and some other - yes, maybe somebody else has an idea. But say to be more precise and to limit the discussion with the SOs and AC, it's only about 2a and 2b.

Heather Forrest: That's super helpful, Bart. This is Heather again. Thank you very much for clarifying that. And I think we should pick that up in this document, let's say, and take the highlighting font color off of 1 and 2 and perhaps what we even do is slightly modify the style of this to show Recommendations 1 and 3 and then separately put Recommendation 2 or something like this.

And I wonder, given Annebeth's comment in the chat, she says, "I wonder, we should try to complete the progress report if we can agree on which of the alternatives of Recommendation 2 we prefer." I think it's a good opportunity now to discuss Recommendation 2 with Bart's very helpful clarification there.

I'm going to open the floor, would anyone like to make comments about Recommendation 2 and the two alternatives to the extent that we can actually come to a view on one or the other I think that would be very helpful before we take this to the community. If we're not able to come to a view on one of those alternatives then obviously we will have to seek input on the alternatives. So I will open up the floor. Annebeth, please go ahead.

Annebeth Lange: Hello Heather. It's Annebeth here. You can hear me?

Heather Forrest: Yes, we can.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, we can, Annebeth.

Heather Forrest: Yes.

Annebeth Lange: Good. I think it would be good for our group if we could come to Hyderabad with agreement on the whole recommendation if possible. So I've gone

through the things that Bart has done, and thank you Bart for doing that, it's much clearer when we have these two options.

So in my view, I think it is important that since the inputs from different parts of the community still are there, and we know it's different opinions, I think that Recommendation, Alternative B best cover the different views I have heard in the times that we have discussed this.

But of course if we can't agree on this when we are talking now, I agree with you Heather, we have to continue the discussion in Hyderabad. But we've done this for so long time now and I'm not sure if we ever end up with an agreement on what to do with the different names. So if we can find a way to go forward and still get input from the rest of the community that would be a good way forward in my view. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Annebeth, very much. I agree with your comments, but I would say let's focus, rather than I suppose trying to agree on the substance, let's try to agree on the process. Hopefully that would be easier than trying to agree on the substance.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, I agree.

Heather Forrest: Would anyone else like to comment on Recommendation 2? Let's say are there aspects of either Alternative A or Alternative B that are problematic to some folks? Bart, perhaps, may I put you on the spot? And apologies, I wasn't in the last call because I was unwell but the primary difference between Alternative A and B is what, let's say, are we…

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, let me go back to, I think that was - that's when we started having the discussion. If you recall say the starting point is Alternative A. And so and that was future work ending with ICANN bylaws. And it was perceived, and maybe you recall this from four weeks ago, some people on the call had some issues

that it was too much focused on the GNSO policy development process. And some disagreed.

What I tried to capture in Alternative B, so that it's just my wording, and with all its limitations because part of it is done with probably, is that say, future work, yes, in principle could go to one but it needed to be considered that, say, one policy development process may have impact on the other end that was one of the major concerns at the time.

So let me illustrate this. One of the concerns, and I think Annebeth raised it at the call is if you would go down the path of turning the Applicant Guidebook into policy and what's contained in there, there will always be overlap with what is now the definition in the overall policy, IDN or Fast Track, with meaningful representation of the name of a country or territory.

And say, and you can see the evolution of this overlap almost in Annex B, I believe, of this document. So if you would go down the path of a harmonized framework and try to develop this through one PDP, it will automatically have impact on say meaningful representation or the other way around, if the ccNSO would evolve its definition of meaningful representation or the, say, take away the limitation of one country and territory name per demonstrable language, designated language in a country, that's the way it's formalized - formulated right now.

It would open up and you would, yes, you would create overlap between the two. And in one way or the other, and that's what we tried to capture or I tried to capture in Alternative B that if we go down the path or say of the discussion is these policy developments processes need to be aware of the impact on the other one, and you can't, yes, one way or the other you have to deal with them at the same time.

So going back to summarize, say, the trend or the direction of travel was to use the GNSO PDP on subsequent procedures that was the direction of

travel of the working group. But at the same time say, some people were concerned that it could not be the only avenue to deal with country and territory names. It might be the first opportunity but it's not the only one. And it can't be the only one because there is overlap. I hope that clarifies the differences.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. Bart, that's very helpful. Thank you very much for that explanation. I have some thoughts of my own but I would like to throw the floor open, would anyone like to comment on what Bart has just said? I know there's been some comments in the chat from Cheryl and others. Carlos, please go ahead.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Hello? Can you hear me?

Heather Forrest: Yes, Carlos, we can hear you. Good.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Thank you. Sorry, I am between the computer and the telephone. I don't want to bring other issues on the table. But there is quite a backlog of issues waiting in line for Hyderabad and waiting in line for decisions about subsequent rounds and so on. And while I understand why some people prefer the Version B, I think we're going to - too far into the tales not knowing who is going to pick up the pieces. I don't want to be in the position in Hyderabad that we give up and we easily slide into a cross community working group because I think that's the worse situation.

There are too many issues right now. The Board is asking the GNSO about the subsequent rounds. And there is no agreement in the GNSO about how - what are the conditions for subsequent round. The IGOs and the Red Cross just fired the last letter a few days ago. A small group of people of the GAC and the Board have come up with proposals to solve the situation of the IGOs. I mean, we have to be realistic that we're working into - walking into a very troubled meeting.

And that's why I prepared the simple strong sentence of A. I really understand that we could improve B and put it in brackets and so on, but right now my only position is let's keep it as narrowly focused on our issue as possible. Let's try not to extend it too far because it's going to be a busy time in Hyderabad and that's why I like the version A even if people don't agree and we have to keep brackets, I like Version A as a more concise statement. I tend to get lost when I read the Case B. thank you very much.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Carlos, very much for your comments. Would anyone else like to comment? I don't see any hands at this point. Look, I'll put myself in the queue and say this that I largely agree with the comments that Carlos has just made. I think the thing that I find attractive about Alternative A is it is expressly designed to fix some of the problems that we've had in this group, which is to say that we're not really sure what the outcome of our work can be.

And in fact we have some questions that we've been asked to answer for a webinar prior to Hyderabad that focus in exactly this way that say, you know, what is our -- are we going to give any substantive recommendations and what's going to happen to those? And I think the thing that worries me about B is that it's not in its lack of precision, which gets us out of let's say some of the concerns that group members have raised, I think that lack of precision potentially perpetuates our problem in terms of it's not really clear what or where future work would go.

And I think maybe that leaves us in exactly the same position that we're in now which is to say that even these recommendations that we are making, they sort of go off into the wilderness and we're not sure where they will end up. Susan, please, your hand is up. Thank you. Susan, if you're speaking we can't hear you. Susan is typing into the chat. Your mic is not working. That's right. Susan, do you want us to dial out to you or let's see. Dial in. All right. So Susan, feel free to raise your hand when you get back on the call.

Would anyone else like to comment on the two alternatives here? Bearing in mind that what these will do is they will go back to our chartering organizations and will be used by our chartering organizations to determine a next step. Perhaps if we don't have any input from our community members in light of the time, we're 23, 24, Nigel, please go right ahead.

Nigel Cassimire: Yes, I hope I can be heard?

Heather Forrest: Yes, Nigel, we hear you. Thank you.

Nigel Cassimire: I think back and forth with Alternative A and Alternative B, they both are trying - both have the same points in that the question is what happens of the CWG, how does it make (unintelligible) process or the policy development process generally?

I've listed them a couple of times back and forth and I - it's the same basic point, you know, and I'm not quite sure what the big challenge is. Maybe we can - maybe they both need to be simplified. I don't have the right words to just toss out right now. But is there any difference between what they are trying to say? They both seem to me to be talking about making sure that the output of the working group are used in the policy development process and that in the future this could probably be done by having a more explicit in the reference or (unintelligible).

And just to minimize my intervention, the other thing I would say really it's to be Recommendations 1 and 3. Recommendation 3 to me just adds one additional dimension, which is an all-inclusive process. And I think that could easily be absorbed into the Recommendation 1, leaving us with two recommendations instead of (unintelligible).

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Nigel. This is Heather. Some of us had a bit of a hard time hearing you. And I hear silence on your end, hopefully I haven't spoken over

you. Please forgive me if I have. I would just like to confirm, Nigel, that you are - that you're done with your comment?

Nigel Cassimire: Yes, I am done. I didn't realize I was coming through what's the word, at a low volume. But just to summarize, I was saying that the idea of an open inclusive process that is expressed in Recommendation 3 to me could easily be incorporated into Recommendation 1 and between the two options of Recommendation 2 I'm not seeing really a difference in the intent of either one.

And maybe it just requires some sort of simplistic (unintelligible) of the language. That basically was my two points.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Nigel, very much. I'll read - since Susan is having trouble with her microphone I'll read her comment into the chat and then I'd like to make a suggestion. Susan Payne says, "Really I was going to say I prefer A. I find B too difficult to understand and particularly what the outcome of the recommendation would be, i.e. what are we actually saying should happen. I think we're leaving it vague but that leaves things in limbo."

And Annebeth has responded to that in the chat. What I think I'd like to propose as a way forward, and we haven't discussed this as cochairs, indeed we haven't had time to meet as cochairs prior to the meeting, but I know that if Annebeth and Carlos disagree they'll say so.

I think we should set up a poll, if staff is willing to help us, along the lines of what Nigel is suggesting. Let's run the numbers. Let's see within our group what support there is for Recommendation A, 2a and what support there is for Recommendation 2b. That might help us to determine how we go with this.

I agree with some of the comments that were made about 2b in a sense that I think I could get to a place that I would feel a bit more comfortable with 2b,

but that would require some additional drafting. And we've taken a few stabs at this so I don't think that maybe that's necessarily helpful. So maybe if we vote on them as they are that will give us a better sense of where things stand.

And Bart and Steve Chan, Bart Boswinkel and Steve Chan, I'm turning to you two as the leads for our staff support on either side. Is it possible to do that kind of a poll, and if it possible to do that fairly quickly?

Bart Boswinkel: I think we should be able to do something online. But it's going to be very simple, say, a question we will email to everybody. But maybe Steve has some other ideas. But let's get back to you and say I think we - let's put the question back to you and to the group.

If the group still wants to publish the progress report before the Hyderabad meeting I think the closing date would be something like Monday, upcoming Monday. We can try to do something during this week. And everybody needs to agree, say, if there is no response then there is no response. We just count the votes casted. Because otherwise you don't have any idea and it's - and then we leave them in brackets if not enough people respond to the email.

Heather Forrest: Bart, I think that's very helpful. This is Heather. I think what we do is exactly that. Let's put them in brackets so that it's, I mean, I suppose it's clear here that they are the two alternatives. And I think what we do is we simply add the results of the poll. We will leave them both in. And let's say I'm picking up on Annebeth's comment. I think we leave them in brackets anyway or articulate them as alternatives. And then we include the results of the poll.

Carlos, you're in the queue. Please go ahead.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Sorry, I was on mute. Yes, I welcome any chance to improve the wording of this. I don't need to vote. I would respect what the group prefers, if trying to draft something or leaving the two options in brackets. I just want to

mention one thing, for either 2a or 2b to be successful, we have to make sure, and I wrote it on the side to Bart, that Recommendation Number 1 really means that we have no parallel efforts in this issue. We need to bring it down to one place.

It might be our CWG, it might be a wide CCWG, it might be the subsequent rounds, but we need to find one single place and the message of Number 1, for me, which is very important, and this is a condition for 2a or 2b, is that that we'll have the situation we have had over the last two years of the GAC having a parallel effort. So I don't know how to spell it. I don't know if that requires some clarification in Number 1 being more strict that what we mean by 2a or 2b is a single space with different participations or with different rules, I don't care. I would go with the majority of this group.

But we need the single space to make progress. And we don't want this process to be captured as I wrote in the comments here by the Hyderabad communiqué of the GAC. And that's what I worry most, I mean, we have to defend our work and we have to try to keep working. And the only thing I ask for is that it continues in one single space. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Carlos, thanks very much for your comments. And Nigel, I'm just checking, is that an old hand or would you like to speak?

Nigel Cassimire: That was probably an old hand. Let me put it down.

Heather Forrest: Perfect. Thank you, Nigel, very much. Look, I think we have a path forward then further progress report. What I propose that we do is this, if we could have staff help with a quick Doodle poll, what I would like to do I think just for our own informational purposes is if you're willing either to identify yourself or your SO or AC, I think that will also help us to see if the response to the poll cuts across SO/AC lines or if we have a sort of blended result.

What I suggest that we do is that we leave the recommendations to Alternative A and B in the progress report as Alternative A and B. I suggest that we add a statement above them that says that these are alternatives, would give our result of the poll and see that, you know, either way, let's say the group struggled with the wording of Recommendation 2, that the group generally agreed that the way to go for work needs to engage some sort of policy development process.

How that was specifically articulated isn't necessarily agreed. And forgive me for drafting on-the-fly, which is dangerous because it's still fairly early in the morning today, but I wonder, how would everyone feel if we re-articulated Recommendation 2? Let's try one more attempt at this.

If we re-articulated Recommendation 2 as the group agrees that the next effort needs to engage ICANN's policy development processes, if we went that simple with the language would anyone object to that, Recommendation 2, that the CWG agreed that next effort on this work needs to more clearly - need to more clearly aligned with policy development processes as per ICANN's bylaws.

I see Annebeth is typing a comment in the chat. Cheryl agrees. Annebeth, your hand is up, please.

Annebeth Lange: Hello, it's Annebeth here again. I tried to talk instead. I think that the problem with that is that in this specific area there are a lot of interest from different stakeholder groups, more than usual perhaps. And even if it's open for the ccNSO participants and At Large and all the others in the GNSO PDP, which is gTLD normally would be treated, it is so many issues discussed in the groups for subsequent rounds or procedures for new gTLDs, so this very small actually, even if it's very important, it's quite small subject, drowns in the rest of the discussion.

And it's difficult for participants from ccNSO that's not into the rest of the GNSO discussion to follow all these discussions. This working group, the subsequent rounds, it's the Work Stream 2, it's Work Stream 3, it's a lot of different work streams. And most of these discussions, I've listened to some of it, has nothing to do with this issue.

So we have to find a way how those participants in our community that are specifically interested in country and territory names especially, and now after the GAC mix it all together, all the geographical names have come in as well, have time and possibility to be heard. And I'm afraid that it will be drowned into the big PDP of the GNSO.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Annebeth. We have Susan and then Carlos. And a note for everyone, I threw some draft text into the main chat. If you want to comment on that that would be helpful. Susan, go right ahead.

Susan Payne: Yes, thanks. Hopefully you can hear me now.

Heather Forrest: We can hear you, Susan.

Susan Payne: Oh good. There was silence and I got worried. Yes, I wanted in response to what Annebeth was saying. And, Annebeth, I completely understand what you're saying about that risk of it getting lost. And I can see that if you're faced with having to try and participate in the whole of the subsequent procedures PDP when you're only interested in a small part, that seems disproportionate and I totally get that.

But I don't think it's -- I'm sure there should be a way in which that doesn't need to be the case. The PDP is broken down into different work tracks anyway to try and parcel the work up. And so, you know, some people are participating in one work track and maybe none of the others; some people are, you know, working in more than one work track. But that was already -

has already been an attempt to parcel the work up to make it more manageable for people.

And then I think within, you know, within a work track, and Alexander has been identifying that work track or Work Stream 2 would probably be the one that would deal with this issue. You know, I think there must surely be a way in which either, you know, notice can go out when we move on to talk about a certain subject or perhaps practically it would be possible since this is, you know, this is quite a self-contained issue but is not just the country and territory names. I mean, there are other geographic name issues as well that come into play.

I mean, it's quite possible for there to be a kind of, if you like, a sub work track so that the people who are interested in this topic don't have to participate on the whole thing.

And I'm, you know, I'm not one of the chairs or anything but it seems to me that that's perfectly possible for the work in that PDP to get parceled up however the community thinks is most practical.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Did we lose the conference?

Susan Payne: Oh no, I should have said - I think I got to the end of what I was saying and…

Heather Forrest: Apologies.

Susan Payne: …and then it went quiet.

Heather Forrest: And I was thinking Susan with mute on and speaking to actually no one so apologies. Thank you very much, Susan, for your comments. Grigori, please. And actually what I had said while I was on mute, was, Grigori, if you're speaking we can't hear you so, Grigori, I'll give you the suggestion I just gave myself which is try turning your mute off. We can't actually hear you.

So we'll pass on Grigori for the moment. Carlos, you're next in the queue. And, Grigori, if you're able to join us then that would be good. Carlos, please go ahead.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Thank you very much, Heather. Annebeth, I have to make a clarification that is in the mail that Bart sent around. There are two papers, and these paper is a progress report. And it should remain a progress report and state the problems and so on. We still have the big document where we have collected many points of views, the background, the history, the different possibilities, the survey, etcetera, etcetera.

So I understand your worries that I think we have done, with the help of staff, a great work in the straw man and in the straw woman, and we just finish it for Hyderabad, but it's clear that we are leaving a very substantial guideline and recollection of the history. So I'm not worried that we will get drown down in other issues. I think it was an excellent exercise. And I use the opportunity to thank Bart and Jaap and all the people who put all this history together. So I don't think we will get lost. This is a very important issue and it will get the time it deserves. Thank you very much.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Carlos. And Cheryl, you'll have the last word on this point and then we will shift to other topics.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks very much. Cheryl for the record. And what Alexander is saying in the chat is important too. But I just want to come in with what Susan was saying. Yes, theoretically, I won't say hypothetically, I will say theoretically, that should certainly be possible in a Work Track 2. As some of you who are involved in the Subsequent Procedures Working Group you'll know I, for one, am active in it so I kind of know what's going on.

But at the same token, and it's also not just one topic, there's a couple of the topics including that IDN's work that would have some issues we've had

interest in, if we go that way I think we need someone to own the responsibility of making sure that that's flagging of opportunity for input happens because it will have its own energy, it will continue powering on and there will very much be risk, and I think it's a very real risk of well we're sorry, that topic was discussed and settled by us last week, you know, I'm so tempted to say something very Australian now. Heather can imagine what that might be. Your input is too little too late or we really don't care.

And it is supposed to be an open and inclusive process. But the facts are if you're someone who's there all the time your voice is going to be heard more clearly and probably more loudly and more effectively. So I think Annebeth's concerns do need to be addressed. I think Susan's proposal of how it could happen is valid, but we would have to be diligent in making sure it was followed through and that some of my fears of not necessarily having the theory worked out in the practice would be then unfounded. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Cheryl, thank you very much for your comments and thank you to all of you who have contributed to this discussion. I think it's been a very interesting one. Sadly I think, you know, more than a full hour of talking about the subsequent procedures PDP what work is happened, what work could happen, what work will happen and how that works.

And I think there've been some very valuable points that have been made here that we need to capture, let's say, as a next step. But I want to return our focus to the document that's in front of us on the screen and indeed we haven't discussed the draft interim paper at all, which is the more substantive document that Carlos has highlighted in the discussion.

What I suggest we do with this, as the way forward, and unless there's violent opposition in light of the time running down to Hyderabad, I think we will run with this, is let's put up a poll with Recommendation 2a, Recommendation 2b and a third option which is a much tighter drafted version of the two, so and

Alternative C. Perhaps not the exact text that I put into the chat but there was some support for a shorter version.

So I'll take the pen and try and draft a shorter version. And the cochairs can work with staff to try and get that poll out. Given that the document deadline is Monday I suggest that we close the poll on Friday. And if we - we'll have the results from the poll, we'll leave the alternatives in here in the document. We'll insert the third alternative which is the very shortly drafted one. And we'll simply communicate the results of the poll, which would be very informal. It won't be open for a very long period of time so we're not going to consider it set in stone, but it will at least give the community some temperature-taking of our own thinking.

I think just to leave these two documents - or excuse me - these two alternatives in the document doesn't give, let's say, an adequate picture unless there's a human being there to explain the document. And we'd ideally like the document to stand on its own.

So I see there's some comments to support that. I note Annebeth's and Cheryl Langdon-Orr in the chat have said that that seems like a way forward. As I say, unless there's violent agreement I just want to see - I want us to make some progress for Hyderabad and Susan has agreed as well.

So let's go with that. We'll work with staff to make that poll happen. The poll will be only open for a very short period of time. Again, for the record, this is going to be a very informal thing because we're only going to have it open for a few days. But it would give us a bit of temperature taking to put in this document. So with that I'll put this agenda item to bed.

We have presenting our progress report to the community, which essentially we just discussed in terms of how we articulate this, these alternatives in Recommendation 2. This remains really the only outstanding item of discussion.

In terms of the mechanics of how to present a progress report to the community to the extent that we make it to Monday's deadline then I would assume that what we could do is the cochairs from either of the SOs would include the document in the progress report in the documents to be communicated to our SOs for our regular SO meetings. Carlos and I can communicate the progress report as it looks on Monday to the GNSO Secretariat and added to the agenda for discussion in Hyderabad and our ccNSO folks can do the same.

And I would encourage Cheryl and others if you want to reach out to your respective SOs and ACs, and let them know where we are that would be very good. But we will of course use the formal mechanics with staff help for distributing the document out to the broader community and put it up on our webpage.

I'll just check with staff to make sure I haven't said anything that's outrageous in relation to the process for putting that information…

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Heather, we can work around that or work with it so no problem at all.

Heather Forrest: Great, thank you Bart. Good. Hyderabad is our next topic on the agenda, Item Number 4. We have a face-to-face meeting scheduled for Saturday afternoon, Saturday the 5 of November. In addition we have been asked to contribute, as we have done in the past, to adverts or policy development or issues relating to new gTLDs.

We've been asked to give a quick summary of where we are with our work. And that would be an excellent time to let the broader community know of our progress report. So I would suggest that we have that posted online in a prominent place.

I've said back to the folks, we've talked about it as cochairs, and I know for sure that I can make this session that's run by the GDD staff. If other cochairs are willing and able to join me then that's great. Back to the extent that we have a clear online address for where we can find our progress report in time for that session that will be very helpful.

And I imagine we need to put together a few slides for that session as well so the cochairs can work with staff on that project. And you see Steve has bailed me out, thank you Steve, before referring to the New gTLD Program review session in the chat and a link to it.

Annebeth, I'm afraid I don't know when the session will be off the top of my head, but Steve is going to bail me out on that one too, which would be fantastic. There we go. So the same day as our meeting, and I wondered if that actually overlap with our meeting? It looks to me when looking through the schedule that we are having some trouble, no indeed, it precedes our session which is very helpful. So 1:45 to 2:45, is that one and then we start at 3:15, so it precedes our CWG meeting by half an hour, which is great.

We need - I'll make a note for staff and cochairs that we need to work on our materials for that session and need to do that immediately given the document deadline is Monday.

The last thing that I want to talk about in relation to Hyderabad is we have been asked some questions that need to be addressed for that webinar that precedes Hyderabad. And I wonder, Bart, can you help us with this? The questions that we are being asked are being asked by whom? And we need to have, as I understand it, we need to have answers to this by Thursday.

Bart Boswinkel: No, this is - so sorry Heather, this is more say as most of you will know policy staff has always - is organizing a policy webinar before the ICANN meetings. One of the topics is this working group, and the practice right now is that

people are asked for some questions. And I'll copy the questions previously questions in the chat.

I think these questions, say, will be asked his staff to respond to. I can say based on the discussion today, some of the answers are not clear and maybe some of you want to chime in or I can forward it to you and I can answer them. But if you look at the questions, I don't know who asked them, but it is very clear it is somebody who is very much and deeply involved in that, I would say the subsequent procedures and GNSO-related.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. That's helpful, Bart, thank you very much. What I suggest we do in light of the time, we have seven minutes left, is Bart, could you drop that question into an email and put it onto the list. And if anyone does want to give some input that would…

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Heather Forrest: … be an opportunity to do so. I think the question when - by when latest in such policy recommendation be expected, I think we can only articulate the timeline that we are working to now, which is to say that we have a progress report that's been published for Helsinki and a substantive report that will come out as soon as possible after that. I think that's the best that we can do for timeline.

I don't think these questions are terribly controversial in the sense that everything is contained within our documents which is about to be made, which are about to be made public in the very near future.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, Heather this is Bart. And I think the bit about, and if it comes up during the webinar the bit about the Alpha 3 codes is probably -- it contained and is included in the progress report. It's noncontroversial so I can answer that question accordingly.

Heather Forrest: Excellent Bart. I think that's very handy. And of course that's the benefit to having our documents in a good state before we get to Hyderabad.

Bart Boswinkel: So the only thing is - the open question is also, say, that this working group is still discussing the way forward effectively post this working group. So this will - say, the suggestion is to close this working group and is discussing a recommendation to the communities specifically the GNSO, ccNSO councils how to move forward. And that's the only open item at this stage.

Heather Forrest: I think that's true, Bart. I think to the extent -- this is Heather -- to the extent that we articulate the discussion now is largely procedural rather than substantive I think. That's helpful.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Heather Forrest: Of course the process is impacted by the substance but I think that would be very helpful. And if you're willing to do that for us? But let's post -- nevertheless let's post the question and email on the list and if anyone has any input they can provide that and if not then I think you're on a safe course for your response.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes…

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: That leads us to - thank you Bart. That leads us to the draft interim paper. In light of the fact that we have very little time left what I suggest that we do is when we send around our progress report I think we ought to include our draft interim paper with that when we communicate this to the community. I think there's no reason, as Carlos has pointed out, that document is full of very, very helpful substantive contextual background to our work. And I think the sooner the community gets that, including the subsequent procedure PDP, that will prevent reinventing the wheel.

I think that paper is extraordinarily valuable in its content. And so when we communicate to the community, of course the finalization of the draft interim paper depends on some of the issues that we are trying to agree here and the progress report, that only makes good sense in that the interim paper will be setting out our recommendations.

But let's then spend our time in Helsinki agreeing on working to agree on the final version of these recommendations, which then feeds into our draft interim paper, which the community will have had a chance to see. And that leads us to following Hyderabad with wrapping up our work by finalizing the draft interim paper.

It's a bit slower than we anticipated, I think we had hoped some months ago back in August, September, to have both the progress report and the interim paper finished in time for Hyderabad and indeed our work largely wrapped up but it looks like it'll take us really until the end of the year to do that. And that's fine. It is where it is and it is where we are.

So I see agreement in the chat from Annebeth, Carlos and Cheryl. Unless, again unless there is violent agreement - I'm not trying to be let's say to dominate this discussion but I'm keen to see that we make progress in the time that we have between now and Hyderabad and indeed between the time that we have now and the end of the year.

So we - if anyone has any concerns about that plan of attack for distributing both of these documents then please do raise that's on the chat and we will take that up vigorously. That leaves us with any other business. Does anyone have any other business to discuss?

We have silence on that item. I have no further business to raise. Let's then summarize, because we do have a fair few action items that come out of this

meeting, and Joke has taken detailed minutes, and for that we think are very much.

So it seems to me that the action items that come out of this meeting are that the cochairs will work with staff to develop -- very quickly develop a poll to work through Recommendation 2 alternatives. That poll will open very shortly, as quick as we can get it out and will close on Friday. The document deadline for Hyderabad is Monday so we will finalize the progress report by adding in a statement to the extent that we have some sort of result, let's say, from the poll, We will include that in the explanation of the alternatives for Recommendation 2.

And we will also work on - sorry - so that's Item Number 1 is the progress report and Recommendation Number 2 and the poll. Item Number 2 on our action item list is Bart will send around - Bart will post onto the list these comments that have been asked in relation to the policy forum and the policy prep session for -- led by staff for pre-Hyderabad. If anyone has any comments on that they can post them to the list and Bart can take them on board for that session.

Item Number 3 on the action items list will be that the cochairs will work with staff to put together any materials that we might need for the new gTLD program, new gTLD reviews session in Hyderabad that we have been invited to that we see, thanks to Steve and his good knowledge of the scheduled, is the immediately preceding our face-to-face meeting in Hyderabad.

That I believe is our three action items. If I've forgotten anything then someone will correct me, hopefully. And we are just one minute over so any final words from anyone?

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Silence. Stunned into silence.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Marvelous. Alright everyone, thank you very much, for your…

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: Thanks everyone.

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: Everyone have a lovely day.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye-bye.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you. Today's meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop the recordings and disconnect all remaining lines. And enjoy the rest…

END