

**ICANN Transcription
CWG Country and Territory Names of TLDs WG
Monday 13 June 2016 at 2000 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of CWG Country and Territory Names of TLDs WG call on the Monday 13 June 2016 at 20:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-cwg-ctn-13jun16-en.mp3>

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you so much. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening.

Welcome to the CWG Country and Territory Names of TLD's Working Group
Call on the 13th of June at 20:00 UTC.

On the call today, we do have Alexander Schubert, Annebeth Lang, Jaap Akkerhuis, Maxim Alzoba, Mirjana Tasic, Patrick Jones, Paul Szyndler, Ron Sherwood, Young-Eum Lee and from staff we have Bart Boswinkel, Joke Braeken, Brian Aitchison, Steve Chan and myself, Michelle DeSmyter

I would like to turn the call over to Annebeth Lange. You may begin.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you Michelle. Welcome everyone and a special thanks to those attending and at inconvenient hours.

This is the last campus call before Helsinki. And as occurs, the main issue on the agenda, we have the (unintelligible) line of Country Territory and Other

Geographical Names Forum planned for Wednesday, the 29th of June from 15:15 to 16:45 in the GAC room in Helsinki.

We will go through the purpose of the forum, the (unintelligible) planned topics to be discussed, communications and outreach and next steps. I do hope that as many of you as possible will participate in Helsinki.

As you know, we are the point in work - in our working group that will benefit some input from a larger community than those attending the working group. The discussion on (ISO31663) letter codes (unintelligible) has shown that there are huge discrepancies between the views from different stakeholder groups.

And the preliminary way forward suggested in Marrakesh doesn't seem to establish a compromise. We have also experienced confusion between country and territory names and other geographical names, so the discussion is far from finished.

So therefore, it's very good to go forward to collect a lot of people to discuss it and I take it for granted that you all have read the briefing sent out by (Bart). I yield the floor to Paul Szyndler now to go through the draft he was the architect behind the way forward. Is that okay for you, (Paul)?

Paul Szyndler: It is, I just confirmed before I start that you can hear me clearly?

Annebeth Lange: Yes.

Paul Szyndler: Excellent. Well, as Annebeth mentioned, it is about the right time in our work to - the working group would certainly derive some benefit from getting some views and some people from the community.

But we also thought the co-chairs and staff had discussions about whether it would be useful for us to engage. We -- a broader group of people on a broader range of topics -- take advantage of the fact that Helsinki is a new meeting format. It's supposed to be all of that interactive pull up your sleeve" so-to-speak and get down into policy work.

It might be useful to have a cross-community group that discusses geographic terms generally. So in a way, we're hitting outside of the scope of the working groups -- the pure scope of the working group -- and trying to have something that that's very high-level and will engage a lot of people in the community.

When we necessarily say, "Oh, our working group is working on three-letter codes or something else," it might be too specific to drag in peoples' interest or get them away from other (fishing). So we've proposed that it should be a very high-level discussion and a topic we've thrown out there as (The Eternal Debate) - Country Territory and Geographic Names in the (Unintelligible).

Part of what the co-chairs are obviously thinking of doing is this will bring together all of the conversations that are going on in other - in all the various parts of ICANN. So whether it's something, you know, a discussion of GNSO or the geographic and regional discussion within the GAC, at least it gets everybody in the room and talking about geographic issues.

As part of the briefing, I've suggested that we almost make it as uncomfortable as possible -- as controversial as possible -- because nothing would actually be better than to have couple of people yelling at each other across the room. Because we've successfully (added) the debate and the issues and the concerns that are out there.

It's to give - the session could serve to give those that have only a passing interest in the topic a better idea of what we're all doing. But as I said, it also (adds) out quite clearly what's going on within the community and maybe there's a possibility of working towards some sort of harmonization. But you can only do that once you know -- what are the various notes going on in different places that we're trying to bring into harmony.

As part of the session by way of format, we originally thought we might try to approach (Brad White) because given his background and his neutrality, we could certainly brief him quite easily and provide a - an impartial balance expert moderator who has done this many times before.

But unfortunately for various reasons, (Brad) won't be in Helsinki. So the second thought was perhaps we bring together a couple of moderators. So someone from the ccNSO side and someone from the GNSO side against to facilitate that balance in partiality.

But also specifically not somebody from this working group so that they can be neutral -- and then perhaps we as working group members can answer questions rather than being hand-strung asking and being stuck asking the questions.

And then the session should also perhaps or we propose that they should have a chair and for that one we propose that it might be someone - (mostly), she's not on this call, so I can drop her name, but (Cheryl) for instance where she then represents the ALAC and you've got this three-way representation of all the different groups -- all participating on equal footing.

I apologize, the vast majority of people won't be familiar with it, but the example I used was the Q & A show in Australia and I assume a lot of other

countries have a similar panel-based audience format. Where the chair will do an introduction and then it would be setting the scene - drawing quite notably on the work we've done to date and would have a couple of examples (unintelligible).

Basically explain everything that I've just done in the last couple of minutes - why are we doing this - sort of session would be. And then over to the two moderators where they would introduce a small number of people that would work the panel - and be asked specific questions. They wouldn't be allowed to make a five-minute introductory statement because six people do that and you've lost half an hour.

So that was - they would be asked specific questions by the moderator. And then similarly, the moderators would go out to the audience and have specific people out there briefed to provide responses to certain questions. And then also just see where the conversation goes. And that is after all the aim of this exercise to facilitate a conversation.

As I mentioned earlier, the use of contentious topics could be a useful tool - would be intentionally inflammatory. So I think a couple of the examples I've thrown in there were - all of the groups in ICANN must harmonize their approach to geographic names. Because, for example, this working group - we're looking to attempt to one, to harmonize the approach if possible.

But if you put out the straw man of this must be done, then we see what sort of comments we get back from the room. We - or the other examples I've put in there, you know, country names always belong to countries and they would be certain - and all of them - all different examples.

There would be some people from the GAC -- and perhaps someone in this working group that would hold that as true. Whereas that would be very inflammatory for other members of the community -- and intentionally so because they would be able to have a pretty interesting conversation over that.

We could also theoretically dismiss the idea of a harmonized framework and then see whether there's any views to that (counter) position. Again, if the conversation gets a little bit slow or there aren't any responses, the moderators would have briefing to help get the conversation going.

The other important tool would be of course interactivities, so we would use cards indicating the temperature of the room. So this again gets people participating rather than sitting passively. Those of you on the ccNSO would be familiar with the traffic light system that we have with red cards for disagreeing -- yellow/orange for neutral -- or green for (showing) support.

And again, with half a dozen questions throughout the day - throughout the session, the moderators would be able to engage people in the room that way. The logistics of how that works in case we get a big crowd or something -- we could deal with later on.

And then most important thing is -- and what I wanted to convey as clearly as possible to the members of this group -- is that this is not purely a session for us. It's not a - an opportunity for our working group to make progress.

But rather we're the facilitators that are coming in and first of all testing out a new model for - a couple of these have been done before -- but we're testing out a new model -- that new meeting B style for Helsinki -- we go - went out into the community in ICANN.

But it more generally helps that group because we really will get a broader understanding of what's going on. And all the conversation's we're aware of - but might not have been brought out to life.

It's also important because while we as a working group might be aware of the different strings that are going on at the same time, it will be made clearer to those that aren't as conversed in this work as we are. Pardon me.

Ultimately we haven't proposed a - yet a confirmed final message. But the fact that I did toss in a - one sort of permutation there that - it's needs to be clear and now what, you know, is there an (aid) for harmonized framework.

We try to get to either a consensus -- which is extremely unlikely -- or a consensus understanding of the fact that there is a gap and where are we going to try to go to then?

And that's where the skill of the chair will come in noting everything that's happened during the session. In summarizing it so that it actually is something useful whether we make a couple of pages to staff - make a couple of page notes at the end of it -- and that feeds into this group.

So Annebeth with that, I think I've outlined as much as I wanted to about the session -- so covering the topic, the format, the style -- how it would work. Could I pass it back to you now and then see if working group members have any comments on that idea?

Do I still have you Annebeth?

Man 1: Annebeth is - you're still on Mute.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you (Paul). Can you hear me now?

Woman 1: Yes.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you (Paul). It's - it would be very useful if someone from the working group has some comments to this. It's - while you're here, it's much more useful for us to hear what you mean - not only the co-chair that (unintelligible). So go ahead. Someone?

Man 1: Annebeth, (Alexander) has his hand up.

Annebeth Lange: Hi (Alexander).

Alexander Schubert: Yes hello. Can you hear me?

Annebeth Lange: Hello. Yes, we can hear you.

Alexander Schubert: That's great. So yes, hi, that's Alexander Schubert. The - I have participated in the GNSO call earlier. And it sounded to me a little bit like they want to get input from us, but what I have just heard in the conversation in this group just ten minutes ago, it's seems a little bit that we are waiting for input from the others.

So the question would be are we going to relay any kind of (mechanism) to the others or just a discussion which could (aid) the impression - yes?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: I have to take (Alexander's) question if I may. This is Carlos Raul Gutierrez on the phone.

Annebeth Lange: Sure Carlos Raul Gutierrez go ahead.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Thank you very much, I'm sorry. Yes, (Alexander), this morning in the subsequent rounds, we were discussing a different session. We were discussing the slot that assigns this issue in the subsequent rounds.

And then in the general GNSO meeting, what (Paul) explained so nicely - congratulations (Paul) - is a session we're having under the ccNSO schedule on Wednesday. So what...

Alexander Schubert: Okay, yes.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Okay, so what you heard this morning were GNSO sessions on Monday and on Tuesday if I'm right. But this is the general session on the ccNSO and that we're planning to accept to try this new format. Thank you very much, (Alexander).

Alexander Schubert: Carlos Raul Gutierrez that makes great sense then. My mistake, sorry.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, thank you Carlos Raul Gutierrez for clarifying this. Anyone else have something to add to (Paul's) suggestion on how to go forward? Okay doesn't seem like that -- no hands?

Paul Szyndler: In the meantime, Annebeth, it's (Paul) in the absence...

Alexander Schubert: This is me again.

Paul Szyndler: ...and could I just add a...

Annebeth Lange: Yes, go ahead, come on (Paul).

Paul Szyndler: No, I'll let (Alexander) go, I heard him in the background -- best to...

Annebeth Lange: Okay, no that's (Alexander) again - yes I see him. Okay.

Alexander Schubert: It's (Alexander) again. So just a short mentioning - and it's - there's certain interest groups out there. And some are very reluctant to allow more (view) to these others - are very keen on having them.

And it makes sense that there is an (unintelligible) discussion where a - controversial ideas are being floated. And shouldn't we just make sure that we know which kind of options are out there and they all get really hurt? Because I have the feeling that for example it would be ccTLDs or some of the ccTLD are not so open to gTLDs where (employee) applicants for example are demanding them.

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: Thank you (Alexander). Hello?

Paul Szyndler: (Pardon?) Yes I just thought I might...

Annebeth Lange: Hello? Yes sure.

Paul Szyndler: Can you hear me? I think...

Annebeth Lange: Yes?

Paul Szyndler: ...this is what you mentioned (Alexander) is part of the art of briefing and preparing the (fish) and ensuring that the chair and the two moderators are aware we as a working group have a fairly clear understanding.

We've for instance spoken bilaterally to the GAC and the concerns that their subgroup has on geographic -- and particularly names of regions for example - - due to the cross-constituency nature of that - of just the chairmanship of this group - we're quite aware of what's going on - or some of the views that are held in ccTLDs.

And then also Carlos Raul Gutierrez and Heather are representing - or at least having a temperature of the room within the GNSO. So I think yes, absolutely it's essential that all of the views are heard out, but that's part of this briefing and preparatory session where - and equally so that all of those views that may not be brought out straight away are actually drawn out.

If somebody's not monopolizing the conversation about - with a particular perspective, then the moderators can draw out a counterview and specifically ask someone, "Oh, well what does ccTLDs think of that?"

And then similarly, if somebody's - is monopolizing the conversation with one perspective, well then a skilled moderator would move that on to something else. But I believe we've got a good idea and that's something we would work out with staff and the facilitators as we prepare the session.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you (Paul). Susan Payne? You have something to ask? Hello? Yes.

Susan Payne: Yes, it's a question to some extent. I'm just wondering...

Bart Boswinkel: Susan Payne, this is Bart. Excuse me, you're very faint, so it's - I don't know whether it's the connection or anything else, but very difficult to understand what you're saying.

Susan Payne: Okay, is that any better?

Annebeth Lange: A little.

Bart Boswinkel: Not really.

Annebeth Lange: Not really?

Susan Payne: I'll talk loudly - is - does that help?

((Crosstalk))

Susan Payne: Just about how do we - maybe I'll put it in the Chat, then it's not going to work.

Bart Boswinkel: I can hear you, so...

Susan Payne: Oh, okay. It was really just a question about how do we ensure that we do flush out all the different viewpoints? And it may be that I missed the very beginning of the introduction from - probably - in which case I apologize.

But I just couldn't (envision) that, you know, we all know that there are some people who are very happy to speak at a microphone or just take a microphone and raise their voices.

And some people who may be are less forthcoming. And so we could potentially end up with kind of the same people (unintelligible) doing as we would see in kind of every session you might ever go to - if you know what I mean.

So is it your idea that there would be kind of counter viewpoints who would be sort of - kind of identified in (unintelligible) or raising an issue?

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: I...

Annebeth Lange: It's a little difficult to hear you, Susan Payne, but I think I got what you meant. And this is one of the reasons why at least we should have these red, green and yellow cards to make sure that at least we could have them feeling in the room that - especially for those people not really active on the mic so they can show what they mean on the different questions.

That's been a problem over time. We know that it's very different out there as other standards that it's - in the one end if someone wants one thing and we have the other - people in the other end of the scale want something else.

So this is a very difficult thing to discuss, so I agree with you -- it's important to get all the voices heard if we can.

Bart Boswinkel: Susan Payne and this is Bart and Annebeth if - so I don't know if you've seen it -- it's in the Chat or in the Adobe Room -- so this is about at least that the moderators should be informed who have explicit viewpoints...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: ...so that's one...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: And secondly, sorry?

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Oh, we have some background noise. And secondly, as (Paul) has I think indicated - I think that was prior just before you were on the call -- the role of the moderators is to see different audience - members in the audience -- and interchange questions for the audience and questions for particular people -- and to allow others to express their view to make this as interactive as possible with as many people as possible.

I hope that answers your question. Are you - raised your - is that a new hand?

Annebeth Lange: Yes I think she has - yes. Susan Payne has still her hand up -- is that intentional, Susan Payne? No. Seems like it's disappeared, no. Anyone else that wants to comment on this? I see that (Laura) has written, "Agreed, card sounds like a really good way of getting an idea of the views in the room without requiring everyone to speak."

So the main thing must be that questions that should be asked. So what about the communication outreach -- should we have something to add there (Paul)? (Paul), are you there?

Paul Szyndler: Can you hear me now?

Annebeth Lange: Yes we can hear you.

Paul Szyndler: Excellent. Just for the two - what Bart's prepared in the briefing document -- the outreach is obviously just a logistical exercise. If working group members are agreeable after this call -- and I've not heard any great concerns about the format -- but rather just a couple of questions about it.

We would then go ahead and try to be clear as to who of this working group with us stops, sends an Email around just to get an idea of how many of us actually will be in Helsinki -- being a different meeting format.

Some of us working group members, you know, might not be there. That way we've got that pool of resources of working group people who we know will be in the room -- and we could potentially ask questions of.

We would then prepare a briefing paper that gives everybody a good idea -- summarizes basically what we've said already -- but perhaps expands a little bit on a couple of those straw man questions so that the potential attendees have an idea of the headline issues or the way the conversation is likely to go.

And then as soon as possible we would send that out to the community through various mechanisms that most notably making sure that it goes directly to stakeholders within particular groups -- that we know are already interested in geographics.

We would then of course -- co-chairs and staff will work with -- will approach the moderators who we've not yet identified. I gave you (Cheryl's) name as a for instance before with (ALA) -- but again some of them are (C) -- some of it from the (G) side.

Once we have them confirmed, we'll then do some briefing with them directly and then also when we get to Helsinki. Obviously we don't have a great deal of time left before the meeting. And then we would - when we get on the ground there, we would meet with them and do a final briefing.

So that way, everybody's got a good idea of what the session is intended to be, how it's intended to run. Working group members would know in advance whether they would be called upon to make a comment just to keep the conversation going.

And then most importantly, the briefing on the session will have been posted out on the ICANN site and then sent to various people. So that's basically the mechanism we have around communicating an outreach, unless anybody has any questions about that.

Annebeth Lange: I think that sounds fine, (Paul). Could we have any - do we know who those - of those attending the call here will be in Helsinki? (Unintelligible) be there? And you, (Paul), will you - you able to attend?

Paul Szyndler: I will...

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: Good and (Unintelligible) will be there? Perhaps it's best that to send out an Email afterwards, but (Alexander) will be there -- that's good. And (Laura) -- it seems like (Laura) is coming. (Maxine). (Unintelligible).

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: I will be there Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, good Carlos Raul Gutierrez, good. So there will be quite a few people from the working group, that's good. So the next steps - and you see that on the (unintelligible) line that Bart has posted that we will try to find the chair and moderators -- and have as posted (dating) session with them.

Seems like it's an echo here. Can you hear me?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes Annebeth, we can hear you.

Annebeth Lange: Hello? Yes, good, good, good, good. So if you all agree on the next steps forward, then I think that we just forward with it. And then if there is any other business you want to discuss, this is the time. Please let us know if you have some comments (about) this.

Bart Boswinkel: Annebeth, this is Bart. We do have one more - say (unintelligible) - one more item, (Paul), any other business.

Annebeth Lange: Good.

Bart Boswinkel: But let's see if working group members' observers have anything to - they want to raise.

Annebeth Lange: Doesn't seem like there's any hand up. So I think you can go ahead, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay, (Yoka), can you change the documents please? Okay.

Annebeth Lange: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: So what we've prepared is a bit of an overview of the different sessions in Helsinki dealing with geographic names, country and territory names. And

there are two GAC sessions -- one is on the protection of geographic names and you can see the time that's on Monday.

And another one is the - on three-character codes as TLDs -- again that's a GAC session. And the - so (unintelligible) will be discussed. And I know the co-chairs have been invited to attend and to share their - the view of the - of this working group for that meeting. Then there is the cross-community session on new gTLDs subsequent procedures. I think this is the - yes, that's the correct timing -- a bit over (unintelligible).

And then finally of course the - this session we've discussed. We'll share this with the working group, so you see there is not a lot of things happening with respect to country names - country and territory names and other geographic names in - during the Helsinki meeting.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you Bart. This is really useful, thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: A question from (Alexander). When is the...

Annebeth Lange: Oh, yes I see it.

Bart Boswinkel: "When is the GAC meeting alpha three codes?" As far as we understand, it's on Tuesday and (Jaqueline) - so it's on Tuesday from the 28th from noon until half past 12:00 and it's in Hall A -- that's the GAC meeting room.

(Jaqueline): Okay thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Any other...

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: (Sue)? Any other questions from the working group members?

Bart Boswinkel: Susan Payne, go ahead.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, Susan Payne. Hello Susan Payne?

Susan Payne: Yes, sorry. I was just coming off the...

Annebeth Lange: Okay. Hi.

Susan Payne: Hello. Yes it was just a quick question about the first session -- the GAC working group session on the Monday morning. I'm assuming from the schedule and the fact that there is all that information about the audience strings, that it would be an open meeting -- that anyone can attend even though it's a GAC question group.

Do you know if that's the case?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes as far as we understand -- and this is from the schedule -- yes it's very difficult to read -- so therefore we will forward -- it's an open session. I don't know what it means in GAC terms -- open session is could be that you're allowed to observe what's going on and not speak up, but I don't know.

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: It's only 15 minutes. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: However defined.

Annebeth Lange: Yes. All right, so then we just go ahead with this plan and we hope to see as many of you as possible in Helsinki. It's coming very fast now. And Bart, don't you think that we should have one more co-chair call before Helsinki? It's still something to prepare before the meeting.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes I think that would be wise, but let's take that offline, Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, we will. Okay, thank you very much for attending and we will see you in Helsinki.

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: This is the best time of the year to go to Helsinki. I'm not sure that is - it's like all light, so being here, you know, you're (unintelligible) what is cold, I will cover -- it's very light in Helsinki at this time of year. Bye-bye.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye-bye.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Thank you.

Paul Szyndler: Thank you Annebeth, bye-bye.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you. Today's meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop the recording and disconnect all the meeting lines. Everyone enjoy the remainder of your day.

END