

Bart Boswinkel:

Session one is – there was a discussion of putting this Working Group One into hibernation because of the variant issue. Chris presented this yesterday or on Tuesday to the ccTLD community as well in say – at the ccNSO meeting and this Working Group, the intention is now to proceed. There was no action needed from the ccNSO Council to move forward.

So on that basis, I've – I've designed an overview for myself, which I will share with you, what needs to be done to get – to reach the Dakar meeting say with the final report of this Working Group, and that will be in conjunction with the final report of Working Group Two which is about the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO. So that's nice and tidy.

And there are – based on this, there are I would say four main areas that this Working Group still needs to address. One is the processes if you recall in the – say the progress report of Working Group One, we left open – or we didn't describe the processes.

Most of them refer to existing processes in the fast track, but at the time the review of the fast track process was under way and probably and I think – and that's a suggestion to the Working Group, it is good to revisit the processes, as defined in the implementation.

And based on the – based on the input from the ccNSO from the fast track review and based – and take into consideration the experience some of you have gained already with the fast track

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

process and has tried to improve the processes and describe them in such a manner that the implementation of say the overall policy doesn't take as long as for the fast track process. So that's one main – major area that still needs to be done.

The second one that is very important is how we – the Working Group will act or how the overall policy needs to be reviewed once there is more clarity around the variant issue and maybe most – probably some of you have been participating in the variant issue project.

My understanding is that the variant issue project will come with its final report and it's still scheduled around 30 of December, and based on that say, there is a chance that the overall policy yes, needs to be revised, but at least in the overall policy for IDN ccTLDS there needs to be a section dealing with variants. So that's – that's an add on in future on the – on the overall policy, but in the – in this overall policy that say if we're working towards Dakar, there needs to be a placeholder, and for the variant issue, so that needs to be opened up. So that's the second major area for discussion.

The third one is I would say the confusingly similar – similarity issue. As you say in San Francisco it became very clear on the basis of the ccNSO of the review, the way confusingly similarity which we say IDN ccTLD strings and for instance existing cc string or cc – to ASCII letter codes is handled is – yes, is an area for concern and needs to be improved.

With the sub-working group that was formed in San Francisco, we had some discussion, not with the full working group, but with Patrik and Lyman Chapin on an initial draft – that initial draft needed to be revisited and that’s still on my plate to do. Unfortunately, I had some other things going – leading up to this week as well, but in order to move forward this Working Group will address at least some questions regarding confusingly similar, and that – say the output of that sub-working group can be used by the IDN Working Group One as well to adjust the way it is currently described in say the draft policy. Because that is more or less what’s taken from the way it’s currently described, it’s taken from the fast records well, and so it needs to be improved and enhanced, and there will be a part in the – say in the basic principles and that needs to be incorporated in the processes part as well. So that moves back to the first area.

Then I think and that is something for – Good morning, Carlos.

Carlos: Good morning.

Bart Boswinkel: This is Working Group One.

Carlos: One, so I’ll wait.

Bart Boswinkel: Oh, you're more than welcome.

Carlos: Thanks.

Bart Boswinkel: So and the third or fourth, and that's more a procedural requirement, because this is a cc policy – formal cc policy development process; at or around Dakar, we need to request advice on the overall policy and on the policy of the Working Group Two from the GAC. That's a formal requirement according to the Bylaws. So it means in effect that by end of September, yes, we need to produce a final report that is up for comment and for both the community and for the GAC in order to meet it.

And if you – Good morning, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: More than Cheryl.

Bart Boswinkel: Good morning, Edmon. I will recap in a minute. So in effect it means in my view that Working Group One needs to produce a draft final report by the end of September in order to hit the Dakar meeting and get it right, I explain you in a minute again. Yep.

So my fourth – or my fifth point is based on these four major areas or three major areas and say the issue of the GAC advice is I think

if you look at the schedule, Dakar is feasible but will be very, very difficult. And in order to get say – doing some backtracking from Dakar, so Dakar is end of October, so that means by end of September, the final reports or draft final report from this Working Group and Working Group Two needs to be concluded for publication. I think – I know for myself I'll be available as – from now until mid-July, and as of mid-August to September. So we have a tight schedule.

That's – I think that's important, and one point I missed is that the ccNSO – and that was probably if you look at Chris's email that was not the – that wasn't correct, the ccNSO Council had not decided yet to put this working group into hibernation. So it was still ongoing, that was necessary for the sub-working group to continue. The idea was to do it at this meeting, but – yeah, at the request or – there was no action needed to continue our work. So that's more or less I think the major overview that Chris has asked me now, and I will drop you all an email to recap this point, and I will explain just briefly to you and Edmon what is happening.

I think in order to reach that date on end of September, I propose that – so I know I have until mid-July to redline in say the current draft overall policy, those areas that need to be improved, or that need to be addressed, and I can make – I'm doing these – can draft very easily an email, say these are the steps that we need to take and based on that, we'll see where we go.

So just a brief recap for – and that's all I had to say, unless there are any questions, and I'll propose a schedule as of mid-August as

well in order to move forward, say from today's – yes, conclusions of – there is a lot of work that needs to be done. Any questions? And I'll brief you and Edmon in the answer when they're gone; any questions on this one? No? Okay.

[background conversation]

Bart Boswinkel:

It needs to be refined, except for – and we need to revisit the confusingly similar similarity issue, because if you go back to what we've produced, and what is in the – say, the draft as it is currently, there is a reflection of the way it's handled in the fast track, and there is – are some serious issues under the fast track with confusingly similarity.

And that needs to be addressed by this sub-working group, and we tried to come up with something, but that didn't work out, so we need to go back first to questions, because that's the way the stability panel handles all these requests; and that is if you look at the draft we have currently, it is the same way, and that doesn't work.

So you have gray areas where there is a lot of confusion and it's not predictable on the sides of the request, so most will go through, there are some instances and I think that was very clearly discussed in the San Francisco meeting, for instance with Bulgaria, and with Greece, say both didn't pass for different reasons, and there are

some of them who are – it's – it was as – because the definitions in the fast track recommendations are not clear, and the way it's handled in the implementation book is not clear that you have some issues. So this is a moment to tweak all these issues under the fast track. That needs to be done as well. Is that – I hope I explained it. Any other questions.

Male: Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

[background conversation]

Bart Boswinkel: No, it's if you look very clearly in the IDN PDP, there is – at least unless the Working Group wants to change it, and that's – in that sense we've copied the fast track process. IDN ccTLDs should be delegated, redelegated and retired in accordance and in the same manner as ccTLDs. So you build upon that policy and that's what we – say, the – under the fast track was done as well.

So in that sense, the overall principle IDN ccTLDs are ccTLDs is maintained. It is only with regard to the string selection that there is an additional policy. So it's still a two-step process. In the next step your question is what is probably very important for the

Working Group to realize the framework of interpretation working group of the ccNSO will have impact on IDN ccTLDs as well, and how they will be treated in future. And so that's out of this policy, this is not about delegation, redelegation and retirement of ccTLDs. So when – once the overall policy is adopted, then say, the underlying rules for delegation, redelegation, retirement of ccTLDs are equal for both. Otherwise, this would be a – yes?

[background conversation]

Bart Boswinkel:

The report – yes, I will send an email, say assuming we want to have say they're two major issues with regard to consultation for this Working Group. I think we want to have a full-blown, say, consultation with the communities at the Dakar meeting. That means at the Dakar meeting, it will not be – we will not be able to ask the Council to adopt the final report, it has to be at a conference call afterwards, but that doesn't matter, that's – what – so that's how to go, in order to achieve it, we need to have something end of September.

A second and this is peculiar for the cc – the country code, or the ccNSO policy development process, formally we need to ask GAC for advice on the final report. So that needs to be done around the same time that the Working Group or the whole PDP will be concluded, so that's on the overall policy and probably what is

Working Group Two is doing, because they still running parallel, that's the nice thing about it.

So around end of September, the chair of the Council needs to ask advice for the GAC for formal advice on say the overall policy, and that's part of the process. That's one of the things when the PDP was designed in order to have – you know to have a dialogue with the GAC on this.

And that's the good thing that we have say GAC representatives as observers on the Working Group, so they know what's going on, so there are no surprises there. Any other questions? Okay.

Maybe just for Edmon and Cheryl, what we discussed –

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Inaudible) reporting our own liaison calls, so ccNSO liaison and IDN liaison. We're actually bad at reporting – so sorry about all that.

Bart Boswinkel: It really doesn't matter. What I just said is say what we want to do – what needs to be done is if you look at the draft report, the section on process is – has not been filled in. It is a reference, there are some new processes there and there is a reference to the fast track process and processes.

As a result of the fast track review, it's very clear some things need to be tweaked, so that needs to be done as well as part of the

overall policy and we can include it and there is a trade off as to how deep we want to go with regard to procedures and processes, as part of this policy, and what is part of the implementation.

And I think we've learned from say the fast track processes itself, that maybe we need to take the next step in order to speed up the implementation and to resolve all the issues with regard to the fast track. So that's one.

A second issue or second topic that needs to be included is because this Working Group will continue, we know we got the variant issue, and one way or the other, there needs to be – it needs to be incorporated in the overall policy in the final report is how are we going to deal with it in the future, how do we revisit the overall policy once there is clarity on how we want to deal with variance in the cc space. So that's more a placeholder, but we need to think carefully how we want to do it, because we don't want to open up again the policy in order to include it, so that's – that's another major issue.

And then the third area is what we've just briefly discussed is confusingly similarity and the rules around it, and the processes around it. We've got this Working Group, it's started but – yet the approach was wrong, we came up with solutions that was already – yes, jumping ahead of some of the issues. So we need to clarify that issues and that's on my plate to refine that document before that.

But that needs – could be included in this one, so the confusingly similarity will be used to improve the fast track, but it will also be part of the overall policy, because we gained the experience and that was the whole idea, we gained the experience of the fast track, and there were some issues.

I think looking through it, these – this is what I've identified as the major issues, and I've asked [Nalia] to say who runs the fast track process to provide input into the process area as well in order to improve it, and so we can advise this to the Board. Questions on these two or three things from you and Cheryl? Yes.

Edmon Chung:

Thank you, Bart, for resaying those first – I'm curious you mentioned about tweaking the fast track, and some of the issues that we need to take on board in terms of the cc PDP here. I probably in the ccNSO world is not as strict between policy and implementation in a way and neither is achieved, but... So where do you see that things could be tweaked in the fast track, and where would we need the policy and just quickly – would there be issues that couldn't be addressed in the fast track, and you know what are those and you know – you know like so that's part of the reason why we're restarting this I understand is you know we want to get this faster, so that some of the issues that couldn't be – might not be able to be tweaked in the fast track could be addressed.

Bart Boswinkel:

It's one of the things probably and that makes it very difficult is the fast track is not a policy, it never was. It is a mechanism that all the community – but that's a – formally it's very, very important. Because it's still floating, it is – the community agreed there needed to be something like the fast track, but there is no policy on the underpinning it. And that makes it very difficult say if there are issues to pinpoint and go back to a policy it's by agreement by the community that it exists. So that's one.

I think but this is a matter of interpretation. The cc's have always have a very liberal view what they think is part of the policy and what is part of the implementation. It is not as strict as probably – as in the gTLD, and so – and at the end of the day, of course, you don't want to be on the – say, you don't want to play ICANN staffers; that's why you ask for the ICANN staff to say what is still involved in say improving the processes.

But I think processes, given that this is a very procedural policy as well, we've got the criteria, and then you have to take the steps and go into the how to proceed through the process, yet you need to say something about the processes, and that's probably experience of the implementation part, and looking at the new – say, that's looking at the new gTLD process, at how long it took, and the whole discussion around it, you could – and I'm taking off my ICANN hat, it's – so if you have a more iterative process build it this way, that there is clear community and staff interaction, and not go into the sequential steps, so more in a rapid development process, then you can do stuff far quicker, and that's why you need

input from staff, that's why the – say, in my view the new gTLD process, because it stuck to high levels and it is a very sequential process, and at the end of the day the – yes, the whole discussion about the application guidebook, yes, it was refinement on refinement on refinement, and it was very unclear to me at least, say what is policy and what isn't.

Because it was done almost in the policy development type of fashion, which is good in a way, but if you can do it the other way around, so it's driven by in this case, the whole policy by the cc's with interaction with staff say you make it wrong, then it's more owned by the cc's. You use this one.

Female:

I can speak loud; we're not that many people here. Just a question. We have to avoid that we do the same mistake that was done with the new gTLDs. That it was come too far, before the rest of the communities discovered what was going on. So then suddenly the GAC and also the cc's, so that something what happening that we didn't really like, and then started, so we lost a lot of time.

Bart Boswinkel:

Yes.

Female:

So if we can avoid that, that will quicken up our – or give it speed.

Bart Boswinkel: And that is – I agree. And that was say if you look at who's in the room, that's the way – that's why we started with these Working Groups and involving other communities in these Working Groups as well.

Female: GAC is not here.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, but Manal is on the Working Group.

Female: Yes, okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Manal is on the Working Group.
And say – and we always and that's probably a difference as well. If you look at the interaction between the GAC and the ccNSO, say if you're – it wasn't there for a while, because they had some other things to do, but if you just look at and say what happened last – or Wednesday morning, and that is probably a – a platform that this Working Group could use as well to – if there is a need for an update, to provide you update, so there are no surprises.

Female: I agree.

Edmon Chung: I just want to sort of declare an interest, is that I'm participating here as you were speaking about the community. I'm participating actually with my GNSO hat on, on this particular group, and Cheryl with her ALAC hat on just to make sure that's understood. So I'll be reporting back to the GNSO.

Bart Boswinkel: But that was the design and that's – say, that's what we learned with the fast track as well. If you don't do it, then that matter is then you have – yes, you don't want to be taken by surprise, because that will stall.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'll be more than happy to have the recording going. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record, and I get very good at just saying that.

I think something Edmon just raised is really important, it goes back to the GAC involvement, and the human band width issue of volunteers on essentially extremely important matters we're working in these – these PDP work groups, and that is perhaps we should look at the advantage of having backup and additional resources available for people. So when I'm hit by a bus as I walk outside today, someone can slip in and take my role. Now, there's two parts to that.

One is my notes and my knowledge base needs to be available in a form that someone else can pick up and brief themselves with, and I'm not convinced that we are doing that as well as we should in all Work Groups, but I would suggest at least with the continuous drafting process that this one does, that's a God-send, so we need to make sure we keep that up.

But I think it needs to be codified, when we look at this review process in the future. And my original reason for putting my hand up, other than the fact of course Edmon can probably step in and become me, and I could do a very poor job of talking to the GNSO, but I could pen a note perhaps.

When we do a review point, once the magic box, the miracle has happened, and we've stepped beyond that, we probably need to think now on bench marking and mechanisms for when we trigger a further review. There is something in my experience and admitted it is very much ccTLD-related rather than my ALAC hat, so I'm switching hats too, Bart. What we found with very new policy which was difficult to socialize and to get the balance between the supply and the demand, we had two fixed points which were time-based. Which were at this point, we will look and decide do we need to look further; and a second one, now I wish that everyone in the community knew about that, and then we said, and after that here are the mechanisms where we can trigger further looking at, but it was very particularly worded to ensure it was not a full review.

There is nothing worse than giving people a loophole to go back and wind back the sands of time. So it can be very much issue-specific. It allows us to close loopholes, react timely, but not have people take advantage of what can be the difficulty in the multi-stakeholder model.

Bart Boswinkel:

Can you forward me the link or a link where I can look into it, because I know say, and then I want to close this meeting, is I know say as part of the overall policy, we've already agreed as – or the Working Group already agreed to have and build in a review mechanism, and that needs to probably be better defined – maybe in the processes bit, and one of the other things that came up in some of the conversations on the overall policy is once the policy has been recommended to the Board, is that we create a mechanism to assist ICANN in implementation in order to get – for the community to assist them, so it's what we just discussed is that although the – and the privacy of implementation is with ICANN staff that they don't need to go full-blown back and that will stall the whole thing. And that needs to be built-in as well, because that's still lacking.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

The short answer is absolutely, but rather than a link, what I will take as an action item, and I actually like action items, because then it gets minuted, someone knows to poke me and go wait before the next meeting, have you don't this. I will undertake to

have our dot AU policy coordinator and policy director pen a little synopsis and take any extracts from the appropriate minutes of this particular work group that I'm thinking of.

The work group for reference in case you just run into Joe in the corridor at some point is in fact the Industry Self-Regulation Code of Conduct. So as you might imagine, something as important as the Industry Code of Regulation – the Self-Regulation there was a few tweaks that we needed to do. But that's the model I would like us to look at, and perhaps explore some more.

Bart Boswinkel:

Yes, and then – okay, thank you. I have written it down as an action item.

Any final questions for Working Group One? No, thank you I'll close that meeting.

[End of Transcript]