

TRANSCRIPT

Study Group on Use of Names for Countries and Territories

13 March 2013

Attendees:

ccNSO

Martin Boyle, .uk
Henry Chan, .hk
Ian Chiang, .tw
Keith Davidson, .nz
Hiro Hotta, .jp
Ron Sherwood, .vi
Paul Szyndler, .au (Chair)
Maarten Simon, .nl

GAC

Elise Lindeberg, Norway

GNSO

Chris Chaplow - CBUC (Observer)
Heather Forrest, IPC

At-Large

Eduardo Diaz (NARALO)
Cheryl Langdon-Orr, APRALO (liaison)

Specialists

Jaap Akkerhius

ICANN Staff

Kristina Nordström, ccNSO
On Adobe: Lars Hoffman Marika Könings

Apologies:

Annebeth Lange, .no
Sokol Haxhiu
Joke Braeken, .eu
Iliya Bazlyankov – RrSG
Maureen Hillyard
Bart Boswinkel, ccNSO

Kristina Nordstrom: Okay, apologies from Annabeth Lange, Sokol Haxhiu, Joke Braeken, Iliya Bazlyankov, Maureen Hillyard and from Hiro Hotta for lateness. That's all I have since Chris has joined. And someone else is on now?

Hiro Hotta: This is Hiro.

Kristina Nordstrom: Hi Hiro. Welcome.

Paul Szyndler: Glad you could join us, Hiro. We've just gone through the list of apologies. And more?

Kristina Nordstrom: Did somebody else join? Did somebody else join the call?

Maarten Simon: Yes, sorry. It's Maarten Simon. Sorry for being late.

Kristina Nordstrom: Hello Maarten.

Paul Szyndler: Well, thank you everyone. We've got a relatively full house here. As I was jesting with a few people before we, not ten minutes ago, I expect to get a fair few apologies because I didn't pick up on the fact that there was a clash between this call and the Center GA and CEO session that they were having as part of that. So that's why quite a few of the folks that were named have not been able to make this call. I have to add another one. I don't have the Jerry Lewis to my Dean Martin. Bart's not going to be able to join us today because he, unfortunately, is also caught up in center events. So it will only be me who is providing the entertainment today.

Just wanted to thank everyone for their time and, just before I started, to offer an apology, for the late cancellation of the last call. We set a fairly aggressive—as I eluded to in my email—a fairly aggressive schedule for calls this year, trying to get some work moving before Beijing. As it turns out, an exceedingly optimistic schedule in that the idea was we were going to move from having gathered all the information, all the work we've done previously, and Bart and I were going to spend a lot of time trying to condense that down into a very, very draft version of the final report. I hope, only in the last few hours, folks would have received an email that would have come in with that though I'm happy to resend it to people or Kristina can do so, if necessary.

What I wanted to do today was just walk people through that idea and, as I—hello, who joined, please?

Maarten Simon: I'm sorry, it's Maarten again. Lost contact.

Paul Szyndler: No worries, no worries. Again, just by way of background, for the purposes of this call all I really wanted to do was walk people through the fact that we have now something that resembles an outline of the final report. We've, sort of, been laboring through the activities of this study for nearing on a couple of years and it is getting to the point—the sharp end or the business end of our work, and that's why Bart and I have worked to develop something that starts resembling a final report.

If all of you had the email that I sent a few hours ago in front of you, as I've noted there, the intent of this stage was just to put up a straw man. People tend to work a lot more effectively when they've got some words up in front of them and they can cast stones at them if they so wish, and that's precisely the intent behind the draft that I've put up here. So please don't take what you read over the next week or two as any sort of attempt at a final draft or a consensus

position. Really, I just wanted to throw a set of words up and see what everybody thought about it. So basically the idea was that we've gone back to all the work that's gone on with some of the hypothesis and the theoretical stuff that we've done about country and territory name representations, some of the data that I've circulated to everyone from the UNESCO survey, though limited it was, and as far back as the initial analysis of current and possible future policies that Bart has done as stage one of our work. All of that I tried to bundle up into a document and I wouldn't call it a labor of love but it was certainly a fairly hefty undertaking. So I believe, Kristina, have I got the steering wheel when it comes to the presentation?

Kristina Nordstrom: You should do.

Paul Szyndler: I apologize. I clicked a few times and got nothing so.

Kristina Nordstrom: Okay, so it works now.

Paul Szyndler: It's all good. I apologize to everyone for my driving. Look I didn't actually intend to work through the entirety of the report. This is just something that I've sent around. I was contemplating the idea of tossing up a few slides about it but Kristina has popped this thing up on the Adobe room so hopefully everyone can see it there.

As you would expect it's a fairly formulated sort of approach so, in terms of we've attempted to set the clear context and background that's the open purpose of the working group which everyone is familiar with, it's words that we've circulated previously, identified the membership of the group and then outlined the timeframes over what we've done. And then the main body of the text is broken up into the three deliverables that we had. So as I mentioned previously, overviewing current policy and procedures which was mainly Bart's patch and that was an areas that—I'll actually move down to that—that's actually an area that I've noted will need to be updated because it was developed by Bart as far back as October 2011. So please, I acknowledge that everything in there is out of date now, that we've put it in there as placeholder text anyway. But this is the first component of our work so Bart's ably working on updating all of that. So where we're at with current policies and then policies that are still continuing to be under development, it's a fairly hefty bit of work that needs to be updated to make sure that it's current.

But again, when it comes back to the first deliverable of our work, that was step one and, as I've noted on the document at the moment, I expect this to be a largely factual statement so therefore not really controversial. As ever, I'd welcome as many study group members as wish to make comments about any omissions that we've made or any inaccuracies. But I beg your patience for the time being, perhaps skipping over section one or deliverable one—section three as it is in the document because it relates back to work that Bart is still updating and, as we all appreciate specifically when it comes to new gTLDs, the material that's in there at the moment will be considerably out of date.

The rest of the document addresses the next few deliverables and, specifically, how we went about our work with identifying all the types of categories of strings that are associated with or could be associated with gTLDs. Throughout the document I draw people's particular attention to points where I've labored on—there have been numerous disclaimers inserted referring to the expansiveness of our work that we have attempted to categorize country and territory names and the very many ways in which they may be used and the way in which the circumstance that we're looking at becomes much more complicated when you throw in the permutations of different languages et cetera. It becomes a very difficult, sort of, (inaudible) deal with and there are quite a few disclaimers in

there referring to that and also highlighting that we don't claim to have the expertise or the experience to try to replicate in two years the sort of work that the UNGGN and others have been doing for pretty much a lifetime.

So I hope that everyone can take into account some of the disclaimers there when you then read subsequent texts which then looks like it might be quite forthright and definitely not intended to be.

When it comes to the overview, so again, when it comes to deliverable one, that was a snapshot of what is and Bart will update that as I mentioned. When it comes to deliverable two, this is where we came down to the work we did in terms of developing a topology and then also the survey and the feedback that came back from that from UNESCO. So again, I've gone into quite a bit of detail with explaining what the topology was, what the thinking behind it was, the categories that were developed and, for this section of the report, just identifying why those particular representations were chosen. So why we went with alpha two codes, why we then went with alpha three codes. So again, starting with alpha two codes being a fairly standard widely accepted representation of that which represents a country code and there's a background and a long-established history with those leaning then into why we included alpha three codes which do not have the same history—not the same lengthy history within ICANN or consistent history within ICANN policy processes until we came to the current Applicant Guidebook and therefore it was included. So therefore, again, our focus is getting all the more expansive but with a mythological reason behind it.

And again, why we included a range of acronyms, abbreviations, it really is just an explanation why we chose the headings that we chose and this is what was in the topology and, for this section of the report, it doesn't actually provide an analysis. It just actually explains that these are the categorizations and, as far as I can see, that would be enough to fulfill the requirements of the study group charter. Again, I'm scanning through it very quickly because there's no point going through it in any great length as to how we went about the UNESCO survey, how we engaged them and the feedback that we received back from them.

I'm just going to come up for air for a second, did anyone have any questions at this stage? I know I'm trolling through it quite quickly but did anyone have any questions or comments? Excellent. I'll continue then.

And then, obviously, heading into the final deliverable, well, this was where we're trying to mesh together some of the issues and the feedback and the issues that have been identified from what happens when you take ICANN's current policies and mesh them together with all the possible or some of the possible representations of country and territory codes. What happens? Are there inconsistencies? Are there any gaps? Again, I'd be very careful as we go through there not to be critical or pass judgment on policy framework. The policies for new gTLDs are different from historical policies for gTLDs, are different from CT policies, are different from IDN policies. It's just an observation that there are points of difference and, when you apply these different policies, different things come out, different ways. And that's what I've been at great pains to state throughout the document so, again, I hope everybody notes that as they're reading through it.

This section of the document reads through, again, the same way reiterating the topology going back through those same categories but adding analysis and some of those things that we discussed at various working group sessions or physical ICANN meetings or teleconferences. This is where the examples come in where we start saying, well, if you start doing this with alpha two codes, here

are a few examples of what may happen. Again, the point here was, even when it comes to ISO alpha two—(inaudible) alpha two codes, when it comes to them, the simple point would be that the list is not static. That changes happen and that that in and of itself hasn't caused, as near as I've observed, any concerns within ICANN policies or ICANN procedures. But by the same token, Keith will be happy to note there's a disclaimer in there that tops its hat to the work of the framework of the interpretation working group that, whether there has been or has not been any problems with how alpha two codes are appreciated or acknowledged generally, it's not within the scope of this group to look at whether IANA is dealing with delegations or re-delegations effectively.

So that's all in there and, if I've misrepresented that, particularly for those that have more expertise in this space than me, then I'd definitely welcome a little bit of (inaudible) commentary there.

So again, look, the rest of this document just bangs through precisely what I've outlined. We had some conversations about Alpha three codes. That generally, from what I recall, are sessions that we've had and some of the presentations Bart and I did generated most of the examples that could be potentially interesting or where confusion may arise.

And then, of course, after the announcement of the new gTLD round happened, sure enough, there were some clashes between three-letter codes and the ISO alpha three lists, most of which have been withdrawn. One of which I note is still (inaudible) so it's just—and again, that being the case, that's great for us as a study group to note that. We don't have to criticize that or anything like that, but we just note that the theoretical that we've been discussing for a long time has now come through as an actuality.

So again, I just sort of put in more examples very much following the—and I regurgitated slides that Bart and I had used previously about other acronyms, abbreviations. I threw in brief reference to historical names et cetera just to acknowledge that the group had considered that briefly but acknowledging historical and possible future names was just a really, really hard page for us to go through and would just really stretch our work beyond what we could manage. So again, some people may recognize some of the slides or the tables that could have been included in prior presentations, that that's basically what I've re-used as explanation for the work that we were doing.

The thing that I really, really wanted to draw everyone's attention to aside from throwing (inaudible) and bouquets at me for the other parts of the report, was where we get to at the end with all of this. And that is in terms of study group recommendations. I have drafted it currently and, as I've said, consistent with the whole rest of the report, this is just in straw man words that have been thrown up because people like to—well, I think work more efficiently in terms of critiquing existing wording, I have put some recommendations but I've stopped short of wrapping it up entirely. My observation, for what it's worth, I think the group could comfortably say, hey, we can quite happily say that we've summarized previous ICANN policies and current policies included, that we can provide a fairly good summary via the topology and the little bit of input that we got from UNESCO, as an analysis of the many different ways in which country and territory names are represented, tick. And then thirdly, what happens when you mesh the two together? Yes, I did some analysis there and I'm happy to take comment on how that could be improved.

But, strictly speaking, if we finished our work there, we've fulfilled the criteria that was set. We've met the goals and the requirements that the CCNSO council originally established. And that's well and good but -- well, there's no recommendation, there's no advice, there's no observations that may lead to

future work and that's the sort of apolitical, relatively neutral wording that I've leaned towards. While I've hinted at recommendations, I haven't explicitly made any. And, again, I was sort of only making it up as I went along in terms of the sense of the discussions that we've had. My general observation was the more we get buried down in the complexity of language and country and territory names, the more we appreciate that this is ludicrously complex, that there is, if you start talking about all country names in all languages, it just becomes impossible to fathom the full expanse of the exercise that you're undertaking. So whether you're looking at protecting all those names or just identifying them and then letting the market go and not considering them as, in fact, irrespective of what decisions somebody decides to make long after the study group is finished, it's just something that is incredibly hard.

Another thing was that—and again, hopefully when you'll read through the document you'll see that the use of lists or trying to establish some authority of resource and thanks in particular (inaudible) there's a whole bunch of the guidance and the documents and the resources that he pointed out along the way—not just the ISO work that also in the other lists like UNGGN, trying to define or develop a definitive list is an incredibly difficult thing to do and I think this study group could make some sort of comments along the lines of the inherent fallibility of lists and trying to adhere to them.

Now that's a bit of a counterpoint to the previous comment where this is a ridiculously hard space if you were trying to deal with open (inaudible) issues. This is very, very difficult so then people would try to draw it down to lists. But lists are fallible. And then from one of the comments I was so bold as to put in there was that as the way that current policies and procedures stand, they don't afford consistent treatment throughout for country and territory names. This is very neutral working again, This may give rise to stakeholder confusion and uncertainty. There are a couple of tables in there. They're presentations that Bart and I had made previously about how a particular representation of a country name could currently end up as a part of the IDN fast-track process.

Another representation would be excluded from that process. One may have been chosen and, therefore, you can only have one per script per territory therefore another meaningful IDN representation can't be included. It could become an IDN gTLD. It could become an ASCII gTLD and you could end up with, perceivably, a range of country representations for the very same country adhering to a bunch of different policies.

That's where I've got to be very careful to draw the line and to stop making further comment because I believe that that observation is relatively factual and there isn't any consistent treatment. It then remains the responsibility of others to determine whether that's the problem and whether further work should be done or whether that's something that should be resolved. And the study group certainly couldn't go into any sort of discussion about protections or the complete absence of protections. We can't do that. We represent the gamut of the ICANN community with different views that people have so it's an observation that can be made and then be taken on further by others.

And really, that was the main thrust of what I was bold enough to put forward as recommendations or observations or advice that this group could make. I did also note at the very end that, as we currently stand for the current version for the Applicant Guidebook, the protections in there are unprecedented. And, again, that's a factual word. It shouldn't be something that is judged as a positive or a negative. They are (inaudible) because there haven't been these sorts of predictions in any other process and whether people want to interpret that as good or bad doesn't much matter. But that this is a starting point and somehow decisions need to be made as to where to go from there.

It is fairly significant because, of course, over the last few years we've had the GAC advice on new gTLDs, the clarification of what principle 2.2 meant and how that should be implemented and now this market has been set for the first round, if anyone's going to be pragmatic about it, then it's very difficult to backtrack from that for a subsequent round. But again, that's something that's outside the scope of this group.

So I'm just very conscious that I've said enough there and that would probably be the best way that I could very quickly churn through 33 pages of the labor of love. Were there any comments or questions that anyone had? I'm conscious that people need to sit back, absorb this and read it but any immediate red flags or comments that people would like to make now?

Keith Davidson: Paul, it's Keith. Just a couple of quick comments. One, I wonder whether we could drop out, like, the members of the working group and methodology and meetings and stuff and drop all that out of the report into an appendix of some sort to keep the report, sort of, focused on those findings. I think that would be quite useful to me just as a presentation thing.

The other thing is, I guess you're hoping to do something in terms of closure on this in Beijing and it's looking very unlikely that we will be meeting with the GAC formally in Beijing so I don't know if they're the future plans or not, either.

Paul Szyndler: Thanks for the comments, Keith, and I noted Henry's observation there. Thanks, all of these inputs about formatting et cetera consider what is there currently and largely a brain dump on a stream-of-consciousness exercise. So yes, very happy to top-and-tail that to help you to make sense. I also—again, when it comes to timeframes, unfortunately, Bart's not on this call so he can't give me a little bit more input when it comes to the (inaudible) council's expectations but, again, our very broadest goal was to get our work concluded before the second round of new gTLDs. And that has always been a wonderful "how long is a piece of string" and it's a date that we can push back and back and back. So yes, the goal was to make significant progress in Beijing. Note that I actually won't be in Beijing myself, unfortunately, so that will slow things down. I'll participate remotely on our working group sessions and, if possible, with some of the other sessions we have with other constituencies but no, Keith, there's no rush, provided Bart and I keep the ccNSO Council advised as to how things are going to get the whole box and dice wrapped up in Beijing. So that means there will be a bit of flexibility.

Did you want to, for the benefit of those—you had your hand up first in the Adobe room but, just in case somebody's not on that room, did you want to?

Unidentified Participant: I actually started to tune into the chat room as well. I wondering how we should do the comments to the report, basically.

Paul Szyndler: Okay, what I would welcome, as completely uncensored and everything comments that you have via the mailing list so that I'm not managing individual communications or if there a particular section that is Bart's responsibility which, mainly, he was dealing with the stock-takers current policies and procedures. So I don't want one of us to actually miss what everyone else has to provide so yes, please, share it with the list. Apologies to everyone for the spam that that may generate but I think that would be very useful and then also we can get people seconding or subsequently agreeing to the comments that people make. So yes, absolutely, that's the best way to do it.

And from here on out, it's basically a case of look, as soon as possible. Like I said, there's no imperative for us to be finished by Beijing and this is nowhere

near that but, therefore, I'm happy to take as many comments if there's a lot of legwork to be done still to stand upon the report and draw out its findings then we'll take all the time necessary.

Henry, I think you're next.

Henry Chan:

Thank you, Paul. Thank you very much for the draft report and walking us through the thirty-something pages. I have one question and that might be because of my inexperience with the ccNSO process. In relation to your comments and observations, actually, what do we as the study group anticipate will be the next step after the conclusion of the study? Because that would somehow, to me, at least hinge on what recommendations or observations or concluding remarks we should put on our final report. I understand fully that might be entirely beyond our charter or mandate but it will be nice to have a feel of what do we anticipate to be the next step. Thank you.

Paul Szyndler:

So a very good question, Henry. You're unnecessarily humble about your understanding of the ccNSO processes because you're spot on them and, in some cases, I suspect many of us are gazing into the very same crystal ball.

With regards to, generally speaking, when this group was established, the intent was this was drawn out of a recognition by ICANN that—or partly—there is a timeline that explains the background for the genesis of our work. But in particular, this all became quite focused when it came to the final version of the Applicant Guidebook and the reservation for country and territory names in there and the fact that this was based on a clarification of the GAC principles which was useful, and also an ongoing IDN CCPDP which continues to be ongoing but which, of course, long ago was—some of these issues were identified as being out of the scope of that process.

So it's a little difficult because—and Keith, feel free, given that you might be a little bit—you can or not but if you're at all any more familiar with that when it comes to the PCPDP and, again, Bart would have been wonderful to have on the call but the wording of all sort of protections and disclaimers and caveats that were included in the Applicant Guidebook currently were based upon the outcome of that PDP and that will likely not fulfill the issues or address the issues that (inaudible) country and territory names in this way.

So that being the case, Henry, to get back to your question, my expectation is that the ccNSO council will be the entity that receives this report. Others will receive it as well but it will be available to them. But, strictly speaking, the recommendations or observations that are made will be made to the ccNSO council and it's entirely up to us what is the next step of work.

It could another policy development process. It could be that we all want to go away and there needs to be a country and territory names PDP, God help us all. But that's a possible outcome. But to actually recommend something like that is outside the scope of this group. It's simply for us, as you said, we're just making the observation of what is and what some of the outcomes might be. At this current stage there isn't, you're absolutely right, any sort—about where it might go.

Sorry, Henry, did that answer your follow-up question too?

Henry Chan:

Yes, so at this moment I think the four points that you put at the comments and observations section would be quite enough already or sufficient as the concluding remarks of this final report because, after what you've said, I can't really think of anything else to put there at this point.

Paul Szyndler: And can I also point out for your benefit, Henry, and other members of the study group, of course, those that might be coming at this issue or participation in the study group from a different perspective, perhaps if they aren't representative of the ccTLD, that that may well be deemed to be that we've gone too far or that the wording is too strong or the wording's unclear. So this is where we have that fun exercise of nuancing. And again, it is a first draft and there will be subsequent changes made. But again, Henry, if you're asked to properly digest in agreement with some of the observations in there, positive comments and, for everyone, comments of support as relevant to everyone as they are—as criticisms are or edits are, to say that you are agreeing, you support X, Y and Z is great. That will help Bart and I do the basis for the final report.

Sorry Chris, I've kept you waiting a really long time.

Chris Chaplow: That's okay, Paul, no problem at all. I think you're being very modest calling it a brain dump. Certainly you must have a very orderly brain if that's what a dump of it looks like. And I thank you and Bart for doing that. I almost feel slightly guilty that it's—so I hope the members of the study team including myself respond to that and get stuck in giving some comments and red lining.

But my question or thought, really, was just about sharing it with our constituencies and whether this was the time to go back and share the document now or whether you or the group had a preference just to wait until the next iteration. I'm just wondering about this. That's my question.

Paul Szyndler: Alright. Thank you, Chris. Look, in terms of the way that the workings of this group have gone throughout or whether, for some mysterious reason, our meetings were always marked as closed on the ICANN calendar—apart from the GAC and that was about it. But that aside, our operations have always been entirely open and, that being the case, there's no reason why, provided that you make the relevant disclaimers to your constituencies, that this is very much version 0.1 and marked as such, that this is a document that needs significant work. Whilst no something that's going out for formal consultation at this stage, I'd be happy for you to share.

I'd like to see whether, before we get to Beijing, especially because I won't actually be burdened with the traveling over to Beijing myself that, over the next couple of weeks if I receive comments back from the study group, we could then share something with the broader community just before Beijing and discuss it with them and those with whom we have time to meet with, run it by them there so they start getting a better understanding. So by all means, yes, share it now. But if, over the next fortnight, we can pull some of our comments together and it becomes a better consolidated effort, then we can have a definitive version that we can share right before and in Beijing.

Chris Chaplow: Thanks, yes. Sounds reasonable.

Paul Szyndler: Cheryl, you had your hand up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Paul. Just following on a bit from what both Henry and Chris have just said. Thank you for allowing us to share even in this preliminary (inaudible) but probably closer to Beijing with our communities. I think that would be extremely useful. Just going to page 33, I have to disagree with Henry. I think we should go one step further. That's not too far but just (inaudible) a little bit.

I think it's probably valid to raise in this set of comments and observations there seems to be no benefit and perhaps some detriment for a continuation of the diversity and variability in the way policies and procedures relating to both the ccIDN and gTLDs regarding the treatment of country and territory names. And I

think we probably should be able to call for ICANN. I wouldn't just say that the ccTLD community is way beyond that. But perhaps call for the ccNSO council to consider its role as a major stakeholder in ICANN to raise this issue and to see whether or not some form of cross-community process could be considered before the second round so that some, if not, clarity and predictability at least precedent and sort of, I'm envisaging here, a lifting of those precedents, if nothing else, of the way these names are treated, have been treated and perhaps will be treated in the future. Perhaps even ending up and this is now staring into the future ball with a use of lists of exceptions there too, type of procedure. I don't think we should second guess those met but I do think, and it might just be my own view and I'd like to hear from the rest of the group on the list we've got now, worthwhile going that one half-step further. Thanks, Paul.

Paul Szyndler:

Thank you, Cheryl. That's a very salient point and one that I deliberated over for a little while. I also suspect I would have shown my colors if I'd have gone any further than I did currently. And what I wanted to do was leave some space as an expansion and you've certainly picked that up very well.

So again, if anyone's unclear on what Cheryl's said—unclear on Cheryl's call for clarity, actually, that there may be some benefit in identifying or establishing some clarity around why there is diversity, why there is variability relating to country and territory names. It's certainly within the scope of this working group to identify that that circumstance exists and the half-step, I believe, that Cheryl may, just to paraphrase there, is this may not necessarily be a desirable outcome and may not be desirable in future policy processes and recommendations this group could be that we work towards something where there is a greater degree of clarity. So—and thank you for your plus-one, Henry. That's noted. And Heather as well.

I appreciate, very much appreciate the comments that I received from everyone on the call now. I have taken them down in my own barely legible shorthand but I would very much welcome that if you have the opportunity to put those thoughts in a very short email and then also additional ones as you read through the document over the coming weeks, that would be very, very useful just to make sure we don't miss anything that people have provided particularly, again, because Bart is part of this drafting team. If he's here, it would be a very useful thing to set up as well.

Were there any other comments or questions at this stage given that we're all looking at something that's relatively expansive in a new document and basically the aim was to go through it today and send everybody away with their homework?

Well, that being the case, I really want to thank everyone for their time. Also for your patience, again, when it comes to the sort of gaps that we had between the conclusion of our work last year and actually getting this lump of draft report together. I really, really would encourage everyone to, as actively as possible, submit their comments, edits, changes, et cetera and I will respond to all of them—back to all of the group via the mailing list so that we can actually get some version 1.0, 1.1 going. Please again, share them with your constituencies now, as long as they all note that this is really just the preliminary work or the preliminary outcome of this group. I would be very happy to exchange ideas, and then try—really try to get something that's a little more concrete before Beijing. That probably gives us a couple of weeks but not much more than that. So again, thank you for your time, everyone. I'm sorry, Martin, I nearly cut you off there. You had a comment.

Martin Boyle:

Yes, just a very quick one. Do we have a fairly clear timescale for this activity bearing in mind Beijing is very close and, for a number of countries around the

globe there is a holiday period in between? So it would be useful to know what you're seeing as your deadlines for receiving comments and producing the next draft.

Paul Szyndler:

Well, thank you Martin. If you'd adhered vigorously to previous timelines that I'd very roughly established, you'd note that we, sort of, missed that stage. Again, that was because the development of this was slightly more gargantuan than originally expected. But I would aim for comments to be received—so preliminary comments, if I had to set an absolute deadline, the end of next week for comments within this group. They are certainly welcome beyond that date but, by the end of next week, I'll then have the opportunity—Bart and I will be able to work together on absorbing those and editing them so that gives everyone, sort of, roughly seven working days to provide an analysis here. And that will only be, sort of, version one.

Again, if you get knee-jerk reactions, initial comments, initial thoughts back from constituencies, again, they would be welcome as well. But again, if we draw the deadline at the end of next week, that will allow us to go away for a couple of days and provide a more finessed version of this document. So that will be step one.

Your broader question, Martin, about the ultimate end game, I have to get back to that point about all we had to do was finish our work however long it may take before round two of new G's and, that being the case, we still don't want to try luxury given the fact that we won't be likely to meet with the GAC, given the fact that not all constituencies may be able to view a version of this document at Beijing. I imagine we will be going to after Beijing and possibly on to the next meeting for finalization. But not further than that because we just can't keep rolling it on. So it really would be, if not after this meeting, then definitely the next ICANN meeting. But certainly the week and half for the immediate timeframe.

Other than that, I didn't have anything else to share with everyone today. Were there any outstanding questions? All hands were down in the Adigo room and that's always a very good sign. Makes me feel very comfortable. Any last questions? No, that's done. Thank you everyone. Thank you very much for your time. From a personal perspective, very much apologize that I won't actually be in Beijing. That's more to do with the birth of a child rather than lack of interest in the work of this study group.

Unidentified Participant: Kind of important, Paul.

Paul Szyndler: Important things, yes. But I will most definitely be participating remotely and I really, really do hope that (inaudible) activity et cetera works well and doesn't actually impact upon our output whether I'm there or not. So very much looking forward to it and I will chat to you all online and look forward to a rigorous exchange of emails over the next week and a half. Thank you, everyone.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. Thank you.

Unidentified Participant: Thanks, Paul.

Unidentified Participant: Bye bye.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you.