

## **Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Country/Territory Names as TLDs TRANSCRIPT**

**Monday 20 April 2015 at 0600 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-ccwg-unc-20apr15-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#apr>

Attendees:

ccNSO

Ron Sherwood, .vi  
Annebeth Lange, .no  
Laura Hutchison, .uk  
Joke Braeken, .eu  
Mirjana Tasic, .rs

GNSO

Heather Forrest, IPC (Co-Chair)  
Carlos Raul Gutierez, NPOC  
Maxim Alzoba, NTAG

At-Large  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr

ISO  
Jaap Akkerhuis

Apologies:  
Susan Payne, IPC

ICANN staff:  
Bart Boswinkel  
Lars Hoffman  
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: The recordings have started. You may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine Thank you ever so much Chrystle Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody and welcome to the cross community working group call on the use of Country and Territory Names as TLD's on the 20th of April 2015. On the call today we have (Heather Forest), Ron Sherwood, (Maxim Alzoba, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Laura Hutchison, Carlos Gutierrez, and Annebeth Lange has one that she might be late today and we received apologies from Susan Payne.

From staff we have Bart Boswinkel, Lars Hoffman 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 (Heather).

(Heather Forest): Thank you very much (Natalie) and thank you to everyone who's joined. I know that for the folks in North and South America the time is a bit punishing and I would note and I'll direct all questions about this to (Carlos) but there are activities in Costa Rica today involving somebody and we did not want to overlap with those so hence our early start time for your time known.

With that in mind we have our agenda on the right side of the Adobe screen and we're continuing our substantive discussion on the front end of the document, meaning the definitions and the discussion of the two other codes.

What I would like to point out before we get into that substantive definition is perhaps offer some input on the very top end of the document and just to see where we are - let's say a bit of a pulse taking. We don't yet have (Yatz) on the call but you can see now that there's a considerable background section in the top end of the document entitled background on country names in the

DNS and I thank (Yatz) very much for his input here. He and (Carlos) were working on this document - working on that information.

I haven't yet had a chance to offer my comments into that. I would like to make some comments. I think one thing that we need to do is remove the first person given that that was contributed by (Yatz) occasionally. It says I and this sort of thing. And I wouldn't mind tinkering with the wording in a few places.

So to the extent that anyone would like to make those - make comments of that nature or any other nature on that background information particularly for folks who have been involved in this issue over some period of time and have perhaps recollections of or documents that record certain decisions taken. I think that's very, very helpful.

I think given the - given the nature of conflict in this area that this background section is a particularly useful one in a sense that it sets the context and it really helps to explain the long history that this has had, the sort of winding history that this has had and explain to the point see that we are today.

So please by all means don't consider just because that section of the paper is not on the agenda specifically, this is the first time that we have a number of these substantive changes up on in the document and I'd like to open that up for the next round. Consider this a rolling post-it. If you have any comments to make then please do so.

Before we then commence, I see (Anna Beth) has joined the call. Welcome (Anna Beth). Before we progress to our substantive discussion on definitions, I'll ask does anyone have any comments or concerns or questions about anything that I just referred to about that background section of the paper. Okay, I see no hands. I see no comments so I'll assume that we're all there and it's understood by all that that's very much open for discussion and revision and comment.

The continuation of the substantial discussions on definition - I think this we're in agreement amongst the cultures. We had a colon separation for this call just to come to agreement on the point that this really is a critical aspect of our work.

While it's in a sense a painful aspect of our work (unintelligible) the definitions, it is really one of the more important things that we have to do given the - given the context - given the fact that this isn't a clear area and then our hope to the extent that there is one of achieving any sort of a uniform framework will depend very much on the clarity and utility of the definitions that we can come up with and that these will hopefully answer some of the questions that have been lingering over the last 20 odd years that the geographic names have been used in the DNS.

My only - I see (Anna Beth) has some comments in the definition section. Perhaps if we - if we scroll to that within the paper so if we can scroll to page seven and actually they commence on page eight. The scrolling is freed up so that everyone should be able to scroll the document themselves sort of point and click.

(Anna Beth) your comments there - would you like to say anything to your comments on those first two - on those first two entries in the definition list? I'm not hearing (Anna Beth) and we'll see what (Cheryl) types in. Right, thank you(Cheryl) and I agree with minor edits and format issues. I suspect they might not have (Anna Beth) yet on the call. Let's then - ah (Bart) yes please.

(Bart): I'm trying to - can you hear me? I'm not sure. I'm muted here.

Okay, I think one of the issues with country territory names as they described here is it does not reflect that I need to check hours in my way of doing what has been listed in the charter and why we use the expression of country and

territory names and why it was used. I recall and I think that's the point (Anna Beth) wanted to make.

The reason why we used it - it was because the starting point for the ISO3166 list and so what it really meant in country and territories in the context of the charter and therefore in the work of this core community working group is it referred to the - the names of those entities as a base territorial entities that are listed in the ISO3166 as eligible as CCTLB. That was - see that's why we came out. It's a bit of a short hand for those names of geographic entities. Thank you.

(Heather Forest): Understood (Bart). Thank you. (Carlos) I see your hand and then I'd like to respond to (Bart) after you.

(Carlos): No, go first (Heather) please.

(Heather Forest): I'm happy for you to go first (Carlos) if you like.

(Carlos): Okay, thank you very much. I was thinking about these comments by (Anna Beth) as well but I do want to comment to the first one - to the territory one. I wanted to comment to the second one. That's why I asked you to go first in answer to (Bart).

(Heather Forest): I see. Understood. Then I'll do that (Carlos). Thank you. My recommendation here in hearing (Bart)'s comments and seeing (Anna Beth)'s comment and then seeing what we currently have in the table, what I think is potentially missing here - I think this is one of our more complex definitions is a breakdown of country names and territory names and then a combined definition of the use of the term country and territory names.

The combined definition country and territory names would be the way that we use that term in this - in this paper and country names might pick up some of this historical information and territory names should pick up historical

information that (Bart) and (Anna Beth) refer to and contextual information, not just historical.

So to the extent that we adopt a definition that takes into account more than simply the context, that's acceptable in my view but we need to capture all of these things. Whether we do this structurally as within this line of country and territory names and then had within it country name and territory name and then country and territory names or whether we have separate entries in the list, I personally would lean toward separate entities in the list for country name, territory name and then country and territory names as a term and perhaps we even use the lawyer trick of capital letters to make it clear on country and territory names but that is a defined term in this document wherever it's used and that refers users back to the definitions list.

I think that would make some sense and happy to - happy to hear comments on that and (Anna Beth) we don't hear you. Are you perhaps able to chime in here because it is your comment that's provoked some of this discussion and I'm interested in your reaction to what I've just proposed? No, all right.

(Anna Beth) when you're able to, please put up your hand if you can do it if your audio works. (Carlos) any point on - any response on the point that I just made before we move to the second definition on country codes?

(Carlos): Yes, please. Sorry for coming in late. I had troubles with the computer but yes, commenting is in the same direction that (Bart) just said. I agree with you we should make a structural separation but once we get to (confidential) names in the ISO list, then we have solved the territory issue.

I agree we should take countries first and in this first box it should be countries only and in my view after reading back some papers is when we talk about country and territory names, we are thinking about the ISO list. So we are talking only about territories in the ISO list. This is my first comment

and then I have a comment on the country codes as well but I will wait for that one.

(Heather Forest): (Carlos) I'll ask you to wait on that because I think (Bart) has a comment in line with this discussion on country and territory names. (Bart) please.

(Bart): Yes, just a warning. It's a - the country territory names has started to evolve and almost picked up its own dynamics. One of the real underlying issues and either it's in the chart of this one or we can have a look at the way it's defined in the overall policy because that's where it comes from as well because the study group is having a spinoff of all the world policy and prospect stuff.

It is - we have to be very careful with entities like Taiwan whether they capture it or not because the way we're going to define this will also have - may have some impact on geographical entities whether they consider country and territories like Taiwan and they - I think from a perspective of say what we're doing within ICANN, we should be very aware of these issues.

(Heather Forest): This is (Heather). (Bart) I realize it's true. You have - you have made a very compelling case for that. there are political issues to trying to identify a particular locale - let's not call it a country or a territory - a particular location as a country or a territory and I would hope that in identifying and defining these terms that we wouldn't necessarily give examples, that we wouldn't necessarily give examples, that we would simply point to the historical practice of what came to be characterized as one or the other.

One thing that I would note here is that in our new GTLD policy making the early discussion around this actually used the term geopolitical names and that may - that term was abandoned largely under the recommendation of the GNSO reserve names working group that said look, that term is too difficult. Let's stick with geographical and we'll work with that.

So I don't think - I don't think we want to try and get into the position of saying well this falls under a country and this is a territory and this is neither and this sort of thing. I think it's merely just trying to understand what these terms are and what might - what might fall in. (Bart) you have your hand up. Is that an old hand or a new hand?

(Bart): No, it's a new one - it's a new one and I just wanted to say - allude to the fact if you would go to one of the - and probably for both GTLD and CCTLD's most important documents - RFC5091 - the way it's framed in there is probably very compelling and supporting our argument is that say at the time say it was clearly written down to say IANA is not in the business of deciding what is and what is not a country hence the use of the - say the bold use of the ISO3166-1out our two code list.

And I think if you would look - so and this goes back to the first point you made. If you would go back to the way it's described in the standard itself - especially again the dash one list - I think it goes back to geopolitical - recognized geopolitical entities. It's almost similar to the language the GAC used to use in the early days in order to capture who attended GAC meetings and who didn't to - to make it as encompassing as possible. Thank you.

(Heather Forest): And this (Heather). (Bart) I agree entirely. You've brought us back to RFC5091 and quite rightly. I think that's a smart thing to do and I think it's very important that we capture whether it's in definitions or perhaps it's in this background section - everything interrelates here so it's a bit hard to say where exactly in the paper this fits in but this sort of context and the use of the terminology is - and let's say the use of different terminology is something that we need to point out - and perhaps then we even make a reference - make an inclusion in this definitions list too that formally used term - geopolitical - to capture that early discussion.

Maybe that's one way to do this or perhaps just simply put that into context in that section that's quite appropriately headed background on country names

in the DNS and perhaps that should even more appropriately be called background on country and territory names in the DNS.

(Anna Beth) thank you for your comments. Have we gotten you on the audio yet? (Bart) I see your hand but let's see if we can't get (Anna Beth) just to confirm. I don't think we have you on audio yet (Anna Beth). I see you're typing. I see. (Natalie) are we able to ring (Anna Beth) in by any chance? We'll leave that for a moment. (Bart) over to you while we work on that technical side.

(Bart): Yes, maybe - may I suggest say that we use something to split say not so much the country and territory names but split between the working group in the cities, country and territories for the purpose of say its work and then consider what are - what we considered names because that's more a structural separation because the way it's framed right now, you stop focusing on the names while I believe that's not really the criteria going if you want to pursue the path of RFC5091.

(Heather Forest): (Bart) this is (Heather). Just to clarify then, let's say you were seeing that term - country and territory name - as having essentially three components. There's country. There's territory and there's names. Is that correct?

(Bart): (Heather) this is (Bart) again. No, I see country and territories as say one component and the names of these entities as a second one because I think what we should be very careful of is to at least how I understand the CC environment is to make a distinction between what we considered a country and what is considered a territory and that's probably - that's why we ended up with something, right - countries and territories - because they say again from an ICANN perspective or a CC perspective I'll treat it as equal and by separating the two, you almost imply they're not equal.

(Heather Forest): Understood (Bart). I think that's a very helpful - a very helpful perspective.  
(Carlos) please.

(Carlos): Yes, I tend - here's (Carlos). I tend to agree with (Bart) but that brings me to (Anna Beth)'s second comment definitely and I don't know if it's the right time to jump into the second comment.

(Heather Forest): Please go ahead (Carlos) because we don't have any other hands so happy to have you interject.

(Carlos): Yes, I think country and territory names are closely related to the ISO list. I think this large comes from the ISO list so we have to be careful. On the other hand when I look at the ISO list, I have to insist that the ISO list is a list of codes of abbreviations and I was caught by (Anna Beth) second comment because she writes somehow it should be mentioned that these codes are understood as representations or identifications of countries and territories.

I think this is a very valuable comment and I went back to just see CCNSO paper. And although they are not 100% consistent along the paper - particularly the initial pages - they use once or twice or three times they use this formal definition there and although they say they are not pursuing a definition of what the CCTLD is, they talk about country codes as representation of country and territory names. They write it.

So and looking at that paper, I think they come very close to the definition - not the CCTLD's but they come very close to a definition what the code is. They say a code is a representation of the name and they qualify it with at least three characteristics.

They say it has to be meaningful. It has - there can only be one - one code. And thirdly although at that time we had no scripts, they say it has to be in or close to the official language and if the country has more than one official language, there can use only one.

And so when I going back to (Anna Beth)'s comment, I would like to stick to the representation words, not the abbreviation. It is a representation of the - of the country name and it should be meaningful. It should be unique and it should be, you know, close to the official language and if it - if there is more than one official language like in Switzerland - Switzerland has four official languages - it should be closed to one official language.

And that brings us to a very sharp - very sharp definition what a code is and by default we're back to what (Bart) just said. Okay, we have a very good definition of code and this would be a strong delimitation of names so I - there was my command on it and I have a second command and we should be very careful and very exact on that and I would recommend to use representation wording that we have in the CCNSO study. Thank you.

(Heather Forest): Thank you very much (Carlos). (Anna Beth) delighted to have you joined us.  
Please go ahead.

(Anna Beth): Hi, it's (Anna Beth). I'm sorry for all the confusion. I was stuck in the traffic and then I had problems getting in too. So now I'm here so I would like to - if I could - go back to my first comment if that's okay. Just to - I've listened to your discussions but I haven't gotten my views in.

So what I meant actually is that the difference between a territory and a region has - it's been a lot of confusion about that so I'm not sure what you mean about tree leaves and those country names and then territory names and conference territory names but my view is that we go out from the isolate. That's the origin for all the - because it's taken the names of all the countries and territories that and the territories there is not the same as a region. That makes the confusion.

So for territory there we just have to use the isolates - only those who have a (unintelligible) from that's there in the list. I'm not sure if I made myself clear there but for me the ISO3166 list is really the starting point for everything.

So when we discussed this, the main reason is not to create confusion in the future by having the same names in two different camps. So some countries and territory names should be a G and others a C and that will create confusion among the users in my view and also the political thing is that even if it's not a geographical protection as you very well known in the long header, this is a lot of - it's politics and policy for a lot of governments and countries here. So we must tread very careful.

Do we know if anyone from the GAC has joined us or still not?

(Heather Forest): Not as of yet (Anna Beth) no.

(Anna Beth): No. That's too bad because I really would like to hear their comments on this on the way while we are discussing instead of them coming in afterwards.

(Heather Forest): (Anna Beth) thank you. I think you've made your point very clearly. I would like to respond to it. (Bart) you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

(Bart) have we lost you? (Bart) has disappeared. (Bart) no comment or have we missed you? I don't want the technology to lose you.

(Bart): Can you hear me now? I'm sorry. Yes, I'm using Skype to dial in and I'm not used to it.

(Heather Forest): Very good (Bart). Please go ahead.

(Bart): Yes. I just want to go back to say the point (Carlos) made. I think we have to be careful again if - that's not me - is that I think so if you look at the ISO3166 standard, what it really talks about is assigning a two letter code to a - I would say in this case a geographical entity.

What (Carlos) listed was effectively the almost a definition of a IBM ccTLD and the need for a meaningful representation. And in some cases and they react and allude to it whether it's a meaningful representation affect some way you could almost argue that by assigning the two letter codes to a country or territory names or this creates the meaningful representation because it's done outside of ICANN.

That's the reason one of the major reasons going back to RSE (1591) for using it. So it's what we do encounter and what we did is using the implementation or using the definition for IBM ccTLD's, which made sense and that's a good thing.

For we're actively or actually done by ISO 3166 maintenance agency because they assign a two letter code to a (unintelligible). Thank you.

Man 1: Hello. (Buslad), (Heather) are you still on the call I'm not sure if we can hear you?

(Carlos): We lost (Heather)?

Lars Hoffman: It looks like it I can hear you it's not...

(Heather Forest): Here I am, I'm here, I'm here sorry.

Man 1: Very good.

(Heather Forest): Mute, terrible, terrible, terrible I was talking to myself. What I had said and I see (Maxim's) comments, apologies. It was, you know, (Maxim) I saw (Maxim's) hand up and (Maxim's) hand went down and if he'd like to make a comment then please do so.

(Maxim) thank you for your comment. Yes (Carlos) there is plenty or introspection here thank you, thank you, thank you. May I offer a response to (Anna Beth) and too much of what's been said.

I think in listening to this I think I'm very happy to remove my suggestion of the three-part definition let's say I think that makes very good sense for a number of reasons that have been mentioned here.

What I see in our discussion is perhaps a challenge in definitions in a sense that we have the historical use or meaning of these terms and then we have our use and meaning of these terms and the two need not be identical.

That this is really our opportunity to clarify the misuse and the interchangeability not often with 100% accuracy of these terms. And I think then perhaps these definitions need to capture - perhaps they're much longer in a sense than the standard traditional definition.

As they say, you know, here's how these terms have come to be understood. We in this report understand them to mean X and so that then clarifies to the extent that a definition is taken on with a slightly altered or a clearer or a modified meaning and that's within our scope to do so.

(Anna Beth) one point that I want to be very careful. I acknowledge your point about the politics here but in your definition of codes in particular you - it predetermines the outcome of this and I don't think that's what the definition should do.

The definition should not in and of themselves be worded in such a way that they predetermine what's in that subsequent table that here are the options and this is the one that we recommend.

A definition is simply that it's a definition and it shouldn't then go to how these things get treated. It can certainly pick up historically and that can happen in the background as well.

It can pick up historically how things have been treated but it can't predetermine the outcome. It's not appropriate that we do that without any explanation and a paper.

That's not - I think that's a dangerous game that we play with definitions if we do that. And I see some comments in the list so that's helpful.

(Anna Beth): Yes I agree (Heather).

(Heather Forest): Okay, all right I think we're just in a bind. And this is why traditionally I think the ICANN community has been (aloof) to tackle this issue in the real substantive way that we're dealing with it now is because it's just blood hard.

It's just every word counts and the absence of a word counts and all of this. I think it's a very challenging area and putting it actually to paper finally taking that effort to do that and to find these terms is the devil in the detail.

And we are the suckers with this job after all of the years right, ICANN 1998 after all of those years we are the ones that have this task. And the community may not agree and we may not agree but we'll at least do our best to try and come to some agreement on some of these terms.

So with that in mind (Carlos) I see your hand please go ahead.

(Carlos): Thank you (Heather) this is (Carlos). I agree with you. I just want to continue on this first two definitions and what we have just said because I think it's important if not a predetermination of the result that sets a little bit the structure of our paper.

In terms of the titles at least we have titled the substantive part as codes versus names and I think this is not right. And I think with this discussion that we just had and then another comment that (Anna Beth) said that first we had only 50 TLD's and the world was fine.

And then the gTLD's came and that created the question and this is the way the ccNSO paper is structured. It says we had codes and the problem started with the gTLD and I tend to agree with this view because then the issue we have is not the codes or the names themselves.

The issues we have if we look at the codes first is that by using codes we have certain combinations that were not assigned or were not reserved. This is our first issue with the two or three or four letter codes.

And then the second step is when we go to the gTLD's and we move from this 20 something three three letter combinations and we can have longer combinations and then what we can have names that are a much closer representation to the original country names.

So we are not talking about codes and names we are talking about the issues we have and I think the issues we have in the beginning I repeat myself now is in the first place not assign combinations of two, three and four letters.

And then in the second step is the choice of the names and having looked at the conditions that were established by the ccNSO paper then the question I have about the names is if we can be stringent and apply the same conditions that we have before at least the three that I mentioned.

And we can go back and check if there are only three but about meaningfulness about only one and about using only official language, thank you.

(Heather Forest): (Carlos) thank you. I put a question in the chat there. In light of your comment that you don't think that the distinction made in the paper in the headings codes and names is all that helpful.

Do you think we should be looking at for example two letter strings as opposed to two letter codes?

(Carlos): No it's just the heading the issue is not the codes. The codes are well established the codes are established in two and three and four letter combinations.

We have a meaningful definition for the codes. The question we have faced in the real world is from the business side is okay give me the other ones the ones that have not been assigned.

So the question is not the codes themselves but the unassigned codes the codes that are not blocked by the ISO list. I don't know if that makes sense.

(Heather Forest): This is (Heather). (Carlos) I guess my question is where do we deal with that? Do we deal with that in the definition, do we deal with that in the options because one of the options and I would suggest we're not there in this call and I don't think we'll get there.

But I think that those options that were sitting there as a straw man in that table further down in this section are not worded as clearly and helpfully as they could be.

But one option in the options list is that two letter codes are eligible as long as they're not in conflict with the ISO list or a second version is they're not in conflict with the ISO list or some other list that exists at that time.

Is that where we deal with that point (Carlos) about unassigned codes or is it in the definition of codes?

(Carlos): Basically we deal with that in the options. I agree with you but we should be very careful in the definition when we say the ISO list are the codes that have been assigned or reserved for states.

(Heather Forest): Thank you (Carlos). This is (Heather) and just to clarify (Anna Beth) I'm referring about the option section in the paper not I guess just to be 100% clear we call this whole paper the options paper and I'm thinking specifically of that section here on page, scroll down Section 1.1.5 about potential option just to be absolutely clear.

Good, good thank you for the input and yes that your comment is very helpful. In my final comment we've made good inroads I think here to understanding the definitions.

I have no illusions that this is going to be a quick or easy discussion and I don't think any of you would have either. My final suggestion for now at least in relation to definitions is on page 9 of the document that you have on your screen we get into questions.

For example what is the connection to the UN statistical use, how are the ISO codes structured, purpose of ISO codes. I don't personally think that those things are appropriate as definitions.

I think the information is very helpful but I don't think and perhaps it goes into some other definition of something. Perhaps ISO lists or ISO code or something like this.

But I don't think these three entities this sort of discussional text is as such a definition. So I think in my view we need to start moving that information helpful information to a more appropriate place.

If anyone has concerns about that very happy to hear those and be proven wrong. I see (Anna Beth) making a comment and I don't see any hands so we'll wait for (Anna Beth's) comment. Yes (Anna Beth) okay as long as it's covered.

Yes I agree this information needs to be included it's just not in my view it's not a definition. And (Maxim) is adding some comments as well. And while (Maxim) types - very good.

Do we have wording for the situation of new ISO code created and gTLD's already in use? I think that it's an excellent question (Maxim) and I think it picks up the dialogue that (Carlos) and I have just had about the question that he raised.

I think to the extent that we can leave for the moment the definition so I think there's more work to be done there that we need to follow up. But in terms of answering your specific question (Maxim) in my view that comes out in the Section 1.1.5, which is potential option.

As I see where those are heading and clarifying what's in the table I think we really have three options ahead of us. And again the wording is essential so I don't want to necessarily try and pin down exact wording here.

But if I were to try at a very high level to say where I think these options sit in their clearest form is, two letter codes for use as ccTLD's only, ineligible as gTLD's option one.

Option two, two letter codes eligible for gTLD's as long as they're not in conflict with the ISO list or question mark some other list. And then third option is unrestricted use of two letter codes if they're not in conflict with an existing ccTLD and they don't fall into string similarity rules this sort of thing.

All of our options have to take a view of the fact that we're obviously not going to remove existing two letter codes. For example we're not in any way shape or form trying to change the status quo on ccTLD's.

We're not going to say to (Camoros) I'm sorry we're taking your code away or something like this. That's obviously not the point. These are forward looking options.

And I think (Maxim) and please feel free to chime in. New ISO created we anticipate that through the options through how do we deal with these things going forward.

(Carlos) your hand is up please go ahead.

(Carlos): Yes thank you very much (Heather). Here is (Carlos) and I like your three options. Actually it should be a three by three option of like to two or three or four letter codes.

And then I come immediately to a question I have to the ccNSO world in are they going to keep leading with two letter codes only? And I want to rephrase this question because for me it's very important.

If we give these protects let's say if we agreed that we have to protect the two letter codes that the ccTLD are using now I want to go very carefully this question.

Do they also want to protect the ISO list three letter codes for the country names? And the next question is do they want to protect the four letter codes for the country names?

And the next question in the same breath is are the ccTLD's going to live only with codes forever and forever or do they have plans to get involved in the names issues?

I think this is a whole new field that pops up by this framework or three options that you just proposed, which I think is very, very important to discuss. Thank you.

(Heather Forest): Thank you (Carlos). Let's see my input to that is on the screen and I'd like to hear (Anna Beth's) input.

(Anna Beth): Yes and (Anna Beth) here. And (Carlos) these are very interesting questions. I can't talk for everyone of course but my feeling after been working with the cc's for many, many years is that they don't have a wish to extend to three letter codes for their ccTLD business.

What they are afraid of as I see it is that if a three letter code is released as the gTLD and then it's used as a representation or identification of the country then it will be very confusing because for example if you take (NO) away we have dot (NO) under the cc and TLD regime with local interest community deciding the rules and then the where it's from.

And then if dot NOR, which is the three letter code for Norway will be released for us and gTLD's and be allowed to be used as the representation for Norway. Then it will be confusing for a lot of people.

If it's not used as Norway but for some other product just like com, dot com is not (unintelligible) it's commercial. Then I don't think they will object very much but it's a confusion they are afraid of.

So I don't think that their main reason here is to take more of the pie or the cake to put it that way but to kind of protect what they have. Is that understandable?

(Heather Forest): It makes sense (Anna Beth).

(Carlos): Yes it's excellent (Anna Beth) it makes a lot of sense and that helps us to put better boundaries to our problem definition and of course (Heather) I don't want to block any future initiative to the ccNSO.

And it's just for the definition of the boundaries and just to say for the time being ccNSO has used only two letter codes as representation for country codes and that emphasizes the uniqueness quality of the country code definition in the ICANN world and we can state it as such.

So far it has been like that period so thank you very much (Anna Beth).

(Anna Beth): Could I just have another comment I told (Heather) that I agree with you, you put here in the chat that we are not in a position to get a future (cc) appeals policy or of course not the gTLD policy I agree completely.

And this is just guessing what I said now is just guessing it's my feeling what's going on in the cc world but of course it's difficult to see. And also I agree with (Bart).

The largest problem is actually the (unintelligible) but well this discussion is actually not as we say not in the definition thing we have to discuss this as options when we get further down the list.

Where we today should talk about the two letter codes I think the main thing is to put the different options that you suggested (Heather), very well put and to see the positive and negative things we're doing especially that and how we can protect confusion if that will be a problem.

(Heather Forest): (Anna Beth) I think that's very helpful yes, thank you very much for your input. And in fact that leads to my suggestion and I'm mindful of time. I've heard fairly positive comments in response to my rough attempt and I'll work more at it to identify the options.

And I think where we are then for our next discussion we'll circulate that, refine that on the list if we'd like for our next call and then we spend some time in our next discussion on the options on those positives and negatives as (Anna Beth) has described.

And that's what we have on the table about benefits and burdens and risks and that will really help us to understand what are the consequences of each of these actions.

At the same time we can't turn our attention completely to that and then drop the definitions as well. We need to still be working in the background on these definitions and context.

And indeed there are a number of sections above here above the options that deal with - and perhaps issues is redundant. Perhaps issues comes out in the benefits and burdens discussion but we need to (unintelligible) status quo and reasons and justifications.

And in light of that 1.2 and 1.3 my suggestion there is that we wrap those two together that that ultimately is and I think what I suggested in suggesting putting that into the document was really an explanation of here's where we are now and here's why we are there.

Perhaps that's picked up in the context and perhaps it isn't. So I think that needs to be flushed out as well. What I propose is I'm happy to in light of the discussion that we've had today I've tried to take some fairly substantial notes.

And Lars I imagine you've done so as well is I'll try and get that to reflect in a new version of the document (unintelligible) and articulate those options as I've done in the call today and circulate that for comments and then we continue. (Anna Beth) I see your hand please go ahead.

(Anna Beth): And thank you (Heather) that would be really useful if we will do that. And then we can send it to each other and try to complement it from both sides as much as we, our thoughts about it is. That would be a very good starting point thank you.

(Heather Forest): Good, all right then not hearing objections from anyone and Lars, (Natalie), (Bart) as staff any concerns about anything that's happened here? Hearing none good. Silence is golden.

Lars Hoffman: None from me (Heather) thank you so much.

(Heather Forest): Marvelous thanks Lars. (Bart) all happy? Good marvelous and (Maxim) I see your comments there. Historical reasons and I do think that comes into this 1.1.2 and 1.1.3 the reasons and the justifications for why we are where we are let's say.

And we'll take a stab at that again the wording the devil is in the detail but we'll take a stab and see where we get to. I think although the progress is not rapid I think we are making progress here and I appreciate the work that everyone's put in at times at relatively inhumane hours and I'm grateful to you for that.

With that in mind we've got some final comments on the list, there are not hands up. Unless anyone objects I think we can happily close today's meeting. (Carlos) go back to bed and if Lars I imagine we've got two weeks for the next meeting, which puts us roughly - my calendar is not in front of me.

It puts us roughly at the fourth of April I believe.

(Anna Beth): Fourth of May.

Lars Hoffman: May the force be with you (Heather).

(Anna Beth): It's okay we can have April one month more that's okay.

(Heather Forest): I can't even complaint to it being, you know, some terrible hour in my time it's very (unintelligible) never mind, never mind. Okay so fourth of May. Everyone thank you very much.

(Anna Beth): Yes thank you, thank you very much (Heather) and thank you all.

Lars Hoffman: Thank you everybody.

(Carlos): Bye.

(Anna Beth): Thank you very much (Crystal) you may now stop the recordings have a good day.

END