

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

Tuesday 15 July 2014 at 0700 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-unct-20140715-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

ccNSO

Henry Chan, .hk
Ron Sherwood, .vi
Han Liyun, .cn
Paul Szyndler, .au (Co-Chair)
Mirjana Tasic, .rs
Laura Hutchison, .uk
Daniel Kalchev, .bg
Annebeth Lange, .no
Lise Fuhr, .dk
Carlos Marcos Luizzi,
Mary Uduma, .bg

GNSO

Chris Chaplow, BC
Heather Forrest, IPC (Co-Chair)
Maxim Alzoba, NTAG
Cintra Sooknanan, NPOC
Gabriela Szlak, BC
Mason Cole, RySG
Scott Harlan, IPC

At-Large

Inam Ali

Apologies:

Olga Cavalli (GAC)
Erick Eriarte Ahon, .pe

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Bart Boswinkel
Kristina Nordstrom
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Excuse me, the recording has now started.

Woman: Thank you ever so much (Francesca). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. And welcome to the cross community working group on Country/ Territory Names as TLD meeting on the 15th of July, 2014.

On the call today we have Daniel Kalchev, Mirjana Tasic Maxim Alzoba, Gabriella Szlak, Annebethe Lang, Liyun Han, Lise Fuhr, Henry Chan, Carlos Luizzi, Chris Chaplow, Cintra Sooknanan, Ron Sherwood, Laura Huchinson, , Inam Ali and Mason Cole. We have an apology from Olga Cavali

And from staff we have Marika Konings, 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 very much and over to you (Lisa).

(Lisa Flur): Okay, well welcome everyone. Bart has sent out a draft agenda. And I don't know if anyone has anything to add to the agenda.

(Anna Beth Taralanga): Hi (Lisa), it's (Anna Beth).

(Lisa Flur): Hi (Anna).

((Crosstalk))

(Lisa Flur): Okay so, well I don't know, Bart were you going to take Item 2, approval of action items and timeline?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, it's just as a starting point, say on the - at the face-to-face meeting in London, the numbers present discussed the - a bit of a timeline and the deliverables from - as of the London meeting, up to the Los Angeles meeting.

So that was captured, I hope, in the document I sent right after the face-to-face meeting in London. And in order to give everybody a chance to have a look at it again and get familiarized with it, we've put it on the agenda again.

So it's more or less to - also to, you know, strengthen the way of working of that say decisions, et cetera, made on two calls. So everybody has a chance to look at it before something becomes finalized.

And I think it's one of the experiences from another cross community working group, which works pretty well, especially with the global attendance we have on this one and in the other one as well.

So it's - the first question is, from my end, are there any questions related to the action items and timelines as discussed and agreed upon at the London meeting?

So okay, then I think if there are no questions, I assume and maybe it's more negative way, does anybody object to the deliverables and timelines and the way of working in the - as documented? If so, please raise your hand and then we can have a discussion around it.

If not, so if everybody agrees then we can - I think we should consider it as adopted by the working group. I don't see any hands up. Is there anybody who wants to make - yes, go ahead.

(Scott Harlan): I'm sorry, this is (Scott Harlan). I'm joining the call. I thought I was still talking to the operator.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Hi (Scott). We're just running through the second item on the agenda, say the approval of the action items and the timeline because it sets the agenda and stay a bit about the mechanics of the meetings from now until the Los Angeles meeting.

So if you have any questions, now is your chance to raise them. Or if you have any comments or do not agree, now is your chance. If so, then consider them agreed in the say as the second reading of it.

(Scott Harlan): Okay thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: No questions. Okay then, I think - I don't see any questions or any hands raised or objections. So consider them approved. So - yes, go ahead (Lisa).

(Lisa Flur): No, no, no I agree when well we've had our chances to object if anyone wanted to. So yes.

Bart Boswinkel: So okay then, say based on this one, say the first item on the agenda for say the first substantive item on the agenda is the review of policy say. And that the question is if you go back to the study group final report, is the say the list of policies, is it still - is a complete? Are they represented accurate and are the actual? So does the timeline agree?

Is (Paul) on the call already, (Paul Shinzer)? No. He was supposed to be on the call to provide an overview of the different policies because he was - he used to be the chair of this study group. (Lisa) do you want me to do it?

(Lisa Flur): Yes please...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: He is there. Hi (Paul).

(Lisa Flur): That's good.

((Crosstalk))

(Paul Shinzer): I am very sorry. Oh boy, oh boy. We're already six minutes in. Yes, I'm very sorry that I missed the early bits of the call. But so sorry, what did I miss Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: We just adopted that you will do all the work.

(Paul Shinzer): Okay, nothing new then.

Bart Boswinkel: No, it's the action items and the timeline as say, as discussed during the previous meeting - in the London face-to-face meeting. And say the way of working, so the mechanics of the meetings, et cetera. That's what we agreed. No questions, no comments, et cetera, so now we are into the third point on the agenda, the review of policies.

(Paul Shinzer): Yes, so I thank you Bart. And apologies again for my tardiness because I think it must be the difficulties I'm having here in this - the poorly and sort of this region.

But with regards to the review policies, as we've noted in our previous minutes, the working group members have been encouraged to look at the policies. And as they were finalize by the study group, the policies were looked at.

And if there are any questions or comments with regards to that final report, to post them to our list. I hadn't noted any. So as such, I don't propose to go into the previous policies in any great detail.

But in summary, we looked at policies and methods - well, we looked at policies for (two letter codes) as they were used as ccTLDs so that simply

asking ccTLDs rules that might have come up as part of the fast track process.

There was also the way in which country names were treated under the new gTLD process, noting that that was an evolving and still is an evolving process, and the rules that were found in the applicant guide book. And they were listed at length in the report of the study group.

And we also addressed a couple of policies under development. So (IDN) ccTLD overall policy, and Bart may wish to comment later about the distinction between that and the fast track obviously and the way the rules were treated there.

And I think that was just about all of them. Bart, did I miss something? I don't believe I have.

Bart Boswinkel: No you have. Did it say, maybe with the exception? That's important with regard to the new gTLD policy is there is the, say the applicant guidebook makes a distinction between the first and the second round. Or no, not the second round and progressive rounds. That's the way it views.

So it's the exemption or the exception under the - in the applicant guidebook that all, say all country and territory names and all languages are excluded. And then you have the rule itself.

And then if that's clear and you can hear me then, I'll go a bit on say the current status of the (IDN) overall policy and its relation with the fast track process.

Currently (IDN) ccTLDs are say - are assigned on the basis of the (IDN) fast track methodology. It's a methodology, not a policy. And that methodology will be replaced in time by the (IDN) ccTLD policy itself.

The status of the overall policy is that it's still in the - it's in the board report has been submitted to the ICANN Board of Directors. But we are waiting for the outcome of one of the new elements in the (IDN) fast track to be reviewed.

That is the extended process similarity review because of the experimental nature of say the, of the fast track process, it was only thought to be appropriate that say this new element to the (IDN) fast track, which was suggested by the overall policy, should be reviewed before the board will take a final vote on the overall policy.

So the overall policy spending is pending a review of the implementation of the second panel, as suggested through the overall policy. That's the status of the (IDN) policy in relation to the fast track methodology. Back to you (Paul). (Paul)?

(Paul Shinzer): I'm sorry Bart. Are you still there?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes I'm here.

(Paul Shinzer): Yes I'm sorry about that. I'm having real problems today. So no, look I didn't have too much to add. But I mean Bart had added some clarification there about the fast track process.

But again, all of the policies that we looked at as part of the study group, we believed at the time to be a complete assessment and a thorough assessment. And I note that over the last couple of months, well particularly since London, there's been an absence of comments from working group members about whether there had been any gaps or any failings in what we've looked at in terms of the policies that were out there and how they relate to the use of country and territory names.

So essentially what I'm asking for is a final call of is there any comment from working group members that the work that was undertaken by the study group is in any way incomplete or lacks some data or we've missed a particular policy process. Or has the environment evolved in some way since the study group's final report was delivered in September?

If there are no comments then what I'd like to do is actually take that as accepted. And we keep that as the first outcome of this working group and move on to subsequent priorities.

Bart Boswinkel: I note (Maxine) made a note in the chat. Is my - say so this is (Maxine). My understanding is that the applicant guidebook is going to be refined based on the (round). The cycle is not finished yet though.

So yes, it's my understanding as well. And this is one of the reasons if you would go back to the recommendations of the study group to - as part of that review and in preparation of, or in parallel with that review that this working group was initiated by the ccNSO.

So and then she added - he added so it should not be taken into consideration. So the current applicant guidebook is as it is. So that's a good thing. So I don't think - I think that everybody agrees with it (Paul) and (Lisa).

(Paul Shinzer): Yes, I certainly don't want to sound forceful in terms of pushing through one of the first major deliverables, or one of the box - I like to refer to it as the box that we're going to take for this working group.

I'd like to strike a line between just accepting what the study group came up with and the casting a fresh set of eyes at it because there are so many members on this working group that were not on the study group previously.

But this was originally intended to be, hopefully, a simple exercise in terms of just checking the percentage so to speak that the study group had covered all

of the relevant policies. So far we have not received anything to list. We've not heard any particular comments.

We acknowledge that some policies are, you know, under development. And the process has evolved. But if there aren't any other comments, then we would like to tick that off as a review of policies for their completeness and accuracy.

Bart Boswinkel: (Paul), (Anna Beth) has her hand up. She wants to raise a question.

(Paul Shinzer): (Anna) please.

(Anna Beth Taralanga): Can you hear me?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes (Anna).

(Paul Shinzer): I think that's my end, not yours. So go ahead.

(Anna Beth Taralanga): Yes, all right. I just had a question about the applicant guidebook Bart, because as it - what we had in the recommendation was that we try to find a result on these complex questions.

And that's why we suggested or recommended that we should keep on with the work and not change the applicant guidebook until we have found, if possible, a solution.

Bart, do we know anything about the work changing the basis of the applicant guidebook? Has that been started at all? Or should we wait until the first round? Or - and how sufficient - or how (unintelligible) the changes for the applicant guidebook overall be?

Bart Boswinkel: I can only answer one aspect of it, (Anna Beth), and this is Bart again for the transcript. And some people are typing in the chat as well. So I don't have any oversight on the applicant guidebook itself.

What I know is the second recommendation of the study group at the time, so that means a letter from the ccNSO Council or from the ccNSO to the board and informing the governmental advisory committee as well on extending the (rule) until - as in the applicant guidebook for next - for the next and consecutive round until this working group has finished its task still needs to be sent.

So, and probably based on that aspect, say will get a response from ICANN staff dealing with the review of the applicant guidebook.

(Anna Beth Taralanga): And this is (Anna Beth) again. So then we don't know how long time this will take before the ccNSO Council will send, if possible, if they do at all, send a letter...

Bart Boswinkel: They will send - they've adopted that resolution. But it was more a matter of getting this working group up and running before sending the letter. And the intention was to do it just prior to the London meeting. But the events - other events took over, like the IANA stewardship transition.

((Crosstalk))

(Paul Shinzer): (Paul) here, just to add a little bit of extra clarification. The intent always was that we would - that the recommendations of the study group would be adopted by council - ccNSO Council.

They were - part of that was again, to advise the ICANN Board that we would recommend a - that as Bart referred to, an exclusion of country and territory and the subsequent rounds of the new gTLD process. But it wasn't so

appropriate to do so until there was a structure in place, an element in place that could take the place of the study group.

And that's why the establishment of the working group took precedent. We've done that now. And it - therefore, the advice of the ccNSO Council refers to an entity that actually exists as opposed to one that might.

So that's hence the timing. And as Bart notes, there have been some delays due to other issues that have taken precedent. But otherwise...

Bart Boswinkel: (It's still), yes, and say the council adopted it. I've noticed a - Marika you had your hand up first.

Marika Konings: Yes thanks Bart. So this is Marika. Just on the note of reviewing the applicant guidebook in the current round, I just wanted to add (note) that the GNSO Council actually resolved in London to form a discussion group which had an intention to basically look at the current round and look at areas that may need future work as, you know, people start maybe thinking ahead of all the next round.

I'm presuming this is one of the items that may come up. And of course, you know, that stage would be referenced to the work that's ongoing. I just wanted to note that, you know, discussions are starting off, at least from the GNSO side looking at what has been done under the current round, which may be areas that require further policy work looking ahead. And that is something that has just started basically.

Bart Boswinkel: (Lisa).

(Lisa Flur): Hi, it's (Lisa) for the transcript. Do we know when the next round is? Or is that - because I'm not aware of it. Are we in a hurry? Or is it going to take two years from now?

(Paul Shinzer): It's (Paul) here, if I may dare to go into my crystal ball. Much of the issues - many of the issues that we raise here are to do with not having any certainty about future timing. And therefore, it's about advising the ICANN Board, staff and others that might be involved in this process about our intentions, our process, what we're going on with at the moment.

It's - we don't know. It's how long is the piece of string. We don't know when these findings are coming. But at least if statements are made about work that's in progress at the moment, that avoids any possibility of what we're doing not being acknowledged.

So it's not working to a finite timeframe. But that was much the same issue that the study group dealt with. So it shouldn't be deemed as unusual.

(Lisa Flur): Okay (Lisa Flur), and I agree. If we don't have a timeline, we should continue working as we are in a hurry I think or not in a hurry, but just continue the work as we planned. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: (Paul), (Lisa), and just going back to say as on this call, say I think they're not really questions about the completeness on the - in the study group report. My suggestion would be that we, as (agreed) methodology we visit this question again on the next call. And then go into the second item say that's around the typology.

And say as - if everybody agrees again on the next call, then we call it say as again, a point of agreement by the working group. And we check that box.

(Lisa Flur): (Lisa) again. Yes, fine with me. I'm absolutely happy with that.

(Anna Beth Taralanga): It's (Anna Beth) here again. Just one more thing.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

(Anna Beth Taralanga): So if it's going on some discussions in parallel with what we are discussing here, it might be interesting to know that because we don't want the same trouble that we had last time. That a lot of things with the geographical names and the country and territory names, they had ended up being discussed in different groups, discussing the same things, but they didn't connect.

So that's a good thing with this cross community working group of course. So it's really important that everything that's going on in these issues should get into the working of the working group so we know everything about what's going on.

Bart Boswinkel: And the other way around. And the other way as well probably. That what's going on in this working group is shared with, for example the as (Millica) just mentioned the GNSO review group.

(Anna Beth Taralanga): Yes, I think that's really important to take care of.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Okay, (Lisa) and (Paul), back to you on to the agenda.

(Paul Shinzer): So if (Lisa) doesn't mind, I think we're actually on Item 4 in terms of any other business. But were there particular comments that people wanted to raise, any other issues people wanted to raise that the scope of our agenda and as far as it's been set so far the work plan? Where there any questions that people particularly wanted to raise?

(Lisa Flur): Hi (Paul). It's (Lisa Flur) again for the record.

(Paul Shinzer): Go ahead, sorry.

(Lisa Flur): I have a question for any other business if we've reached Item 4. And that is in the report you made, you had a scope and you had a specific - just need to see the complete title, sorry, purpose and scope of activities.

And then now we have a charter. Do any of the purpose from the former scope and purpose go into the new charter? Or is that as it is? Or what's the plan with those two documents? And what is the difference between our charter and the older purpose and scope? That's a lot of questions. I'm sorry but.

(Paul Shinzer): Thank you for the quest - more questions. I think I can answer, I hope I can answer them as one. I've referred to it previously as not wanting to dwell on the ghost of the previous study group.

The group has made - that group has concluded its work. And we must acknowledge that there are a lot of people on this working group that weren't on that study group.

There are recommendations that have come out of that group. And that's what we're attempting to address one by one in terms of recommendations (were then) adopted which have become the preliminary action items of this group.

It just to set our theme - to (set) us going. That includes just checking that the policy review that was undertaken by the previous study group was complete and appropriate. Checking that the methodology and the processes of that work - that group went through, were complete and appropriate.

It's not meant to guide nor limit the scope of this working group. The overarching document becomes the charter for this. The charter is the overarching document for this group.

It's just a case of when we're going through those early stages where we're making sure that all of the study group's activities were as everyone expects. Everyone is comfortable with that. And then we move on. It's just a transition

phase we have now. It's not meant to necessarily curtail the activities of this working group in any way.

(Lisa Flur): Hi, it's (Lisa Flur) again. Well I'm fine with that. I was just curious about the link between those two.

(Paul Shinzer): Yes it's (Paul) again here. And I don't want us to monopolize the conversation, but again, it's making sure that all of the new members of this working group are comfortable with what came from the study group. Giving everybody an opportunity to question the find - not question the findings of it, but making sure the procedures were (sound) and thorough.

And then that as a basis gives us a good basis to move on into subsequent workings of this group. And that's where it takes on its own life. It does not need to be bound to the outcomes of the study group, aside from the recommendations, as everyone's already read.

Bart Boswinkel: Any other questions? No, not in the chat, nothing. You want to move on to the next item? So that's next meetings.

(Paul Shinzer): Bart I don't have a schedule in front of me. And (Lisa) and I are sort of juggling the...

Bart Boswinkel: No, no the next item is the next meetings.

(Paul Shinzer): No, no that's fine. I don't have in front of me the schedule as was proposed in London. But I believe...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, we haven't set up for a date. There is one question that is relevant for everybody. Is say the first call we had with this working group that was prior

to the London meeting was at, I believe it was at 8 am UTC or earlier. So that was difficult for the people in the western hemisphere.

This one is around noon. So this one is at noon UTC. It's difficult for, again for people in the western hemisphere and for (Paul) and the others in the Far East, in Australia, et cetera.

What say one of the point of discussion was to start working on the basis of rotational time slots. So a fixed day, say either on Tuesday, but then rotate the times every time plus six hours or something, you know, six or seven hours so everybody would have the pain of inconvenient calls.

So that was a first item. So do we need to do - have these calls on the basis of time rotation? So that was the first question. Any comments, questions around that or agree? (Anna Beth).

(Anna Beth Taralanga): Yes, it's (Anna Beth Taralanga). And when I worked for the governmental advisory committee, when we had teleconferences like that we had one western and one eastern call on the same agenda. So it's possible for both to have a good time. Will that be too much for the secretariat?

Bart Boswinkel: It probably - yes. And it's not just the secretariat, but also for the chairs because they need to attend. And then you have a coordination issue between them. So it's maybe.

And that's one of the reasons for having the basic rule of no final decisions in one call, only after two calls.

(Anna Beth Taralanga): Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Anybody else with questions, comments on the rotational basis or objection to it?

(Paul Shinzer): Bart it's (Paul) if I may. As one of the victims of the Far East as you put it, I would welcome and I'm quite used to having a rotational basis for teleconferences that's happened with other working groups previously.

I think we need to, as (Heather) alluded to in London, make a pretty firm assessment of who participates on which calls. Therefore, we take our decisions about when we schedule our calls not based on what the overall demographic of the group is and where everyone's located, but rather whose actually participating.

And (Heather) was quite firm on that. So I shall remind her of that given that she's not on this call. But the key point being that we work around both via a doodle poll or other mechanism or whatever it is, actually are committing to this regularly.

I'm very happy to do late calls. I'm very happy to do early calls. I think that is only fair. And we can't deviate from that process unless there's a real driver to do otherwise because that would be too exclusive. So I'm happy with that unless others have other opinions.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay so based on this what we will do as a secretariat, we will send out a doodle poll with - on rotational basis for calls. And probably we need to agree upon it first of all online, but confirm it.

And end of August call, for end of August, mid-September and early October, but that's a tentative one before the LA meeting if we need to finalize anything before the LA meeting. I think that is the easiest way forward.

(Paul Shinzer): It's (Paul) again. I'm sorry, I'm not in front of the Adobe. So if there are no hands up, again I would encourage everyone to provide their input to that doodle poll.

I'm very happy for us to do this on a rotational basis. But again, we need to, as (Heather) stated in London, get moving with this group. And get some parameters around people's participation.

And from the experience of the study group, it's too easy to lag from meeting to meeting. So although it seems like a rather assertive schedule in terms of something in August and then September and then quite possibly early October, I believe personally that that's an appropriate schedule for us to stick to as, you know, before we get to LA so that the group actually has something to discuss there.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. And what is also included because of say if you go back to the objectives, it's by the Los Angeles meeting is that we will take a first crack at the say the feasibility, and pull some discussion on the feasibility of the framework.

So by then we should have concluded the prep work. And everybody should be up to speed. And in order to do that is the proposal will be to have a 90-minute discussion late Sunday afternoon on say the first Sunday during the Los Angeles meeting.

And I think that was - if that's fine, then I don't have anything else on that. So we've concluded Number 5 on the agenda item on the agenda. So that was next meetings.

Again, as an action we will send out a doodle poll. And then by end of August will be the next meeting. And that will be on the review. Say first of all, revisit the (better) on the policies for final confirmation. And then start the review of the typology as introduced by the study group.

So everybody is requested to have a look again at the typology of the - as developed by the study group in preparation of that call. And to check if there are questions, et cetera.

And again, to - for confirmation of starting point. And that's it I believe. So now we are onto Item Number 6, closure -- (Lisa), (Paul).

(Lisa Flur): Well I have no further, so (Paul) if you have anything.

(Paul Shinzer): I'm sorry, I do tend to monopolize these calls, but no, I have nothing else to add. Thank you everyone for your time. And look forward to receiving emails from the secretariat in the next couple of days confirming our next engagement.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay thank you.

(Paul Shinzer): Thank you all.

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Bye.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Bye.

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Francesca). You may now stop the recordings.
Thank you.

END