

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

**Monday 2 March 2015 at 2100 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-02mar15-en.mp3>

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

### **Attendees:**

#### **ccNSO**

Ron Sherwood, .vi  
Annebeth Lange, .no  
Mirjana Tasic, .rs  
Laura Hutchison, .uk  
Young-Eum Lee, .kr  
Joke Braeken, .eu

#### **GNSO**

Heather Forrest, IPC (Co-Chair)  
Carlos Raul Gutierrez, NPOC  
Maxim Alzoba, NTAG  
Griffin Barnett, IPC  
Susan Payne, IPC

#### **At-Large**

#### **ISO**

Jaap Akkerhuis

Apologies:

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings  
Patrick Jones  
Bart Boswinkel  
Lars Hoffman  
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: The recordings have been started. Please proceed.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much, (Marcel). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the Cross Community Working Group on use of Country Territory Names as TLDs on the 2nd of March, 2015.

On the call today we have Maxim Alzoba, Ron Sherwood, Annebeth Lange, Carlos Raul Gutierrez, Mirjana Tasic, Jaap Akkerhuis, Joke Braeken, Laura Hutchison, Griffin Barnett and Heather Forrest. Susan Payne sent an email earlier saying that she will be joining a few minutes late. We received no apologies for today's call. And from staff we have Marika Konings, Bart Boswinkel, Patrick Jones, 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 Forrest: Marvelous. Thank you very much, Nathalie. And welcome, everyone. Thank you for being on the call. Much appreciated. We have some follow up items on our agenda today that really come out of our productive meeting in Singapore. And I suppose we should jump right in and get started.

And our first item on the agenda is really a review of the ICANN meeting and what happened there in terms of our group. And I'll say a few words and then I'll be happy to ask for some input from Annebeth and Carlos in particular.

I think two things really marks in my mind - mark what we've achieved in Singapore. One is the production of and circulation of an approval of the strawman options paper as a way to work forward in terms of how we deal

with the difficult substantive issues that we are chartered to deal with. And we'll turn to that.

Next, we have a new version of that document that has some, I think, input from a - if we can call it that, critical (friend) that I think we'll find quite helpful. And the second - the second thing I think that characterizes Singapore and our group is increased involvement with the GAC particularly around the proposal prepared by Argentina and a number of other governments in relation to the - I guess we're calling it the geographic names proposal.

Some interaction in our meeting in Singapore and then a number of were asked in a variety of capacities, I suppose, not in the capacity of the CWG, but asked to participate in a panel session that was held on the - was it the Wednesday, Annebeth? Do I remember that right?

Annebeth Lange: Yeah, yeah, I think so.

Heather Forrest: Yeah, the Wednesday. And I - Carlos and I were asked by the chair of the GNSO Council to speak for the GNSO. And Annebeth was asked to speak on behalf of the ccNSO. Annebeth, I'll let you - would you like to offer your thoughts on how that went and how that was received?

Annebeth Lange: Yes, yeah, thank you, this is Annebeth. I think the good thing about it was that we got a possibility there to try to explain to the governments the difference between all geographical names as a whole and the specific task that we have been given in the cross community working group to take a look on the country names or country and territory names that's deriving from ISOC 3166 because Olga Cavalli had included everything in the group that they have working with protection of geographical names.

And our main object at that meeting was to make them understand our task and to invite them to participate in this group so we didn't have two different

results when we finish our work and they finish their work it will be very unfortunate if we have two different solutions or two different suggestions.

At least in their communiqué from Singapore they have written that the working group will continue its work intercessionally including GAC engagement with our working group. So let's hope that that is a positive tendency and that we can get them to work with us.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, thank you Annebeth. And I thought - I thought the ccNSO's comments delivered by you were very clearly and succinctly delivered. I think I'd be very surprised if there was any confusion as to the ccNSO's view on this so I think that was extraordinarily helpful.

Carlos, would you like to offer our thoughts on not only let's say - and you spoke directly to the cross community working group to our existence but then had some discussions with folks afterwards. Would you like to offer your thoughts?

Carlos Gutierrez: Yes, thank you. This is Carlos for the record. I had a chance to talk with the GAC chair in particular and I think a most important message that we got from him is that this issue is a priority. This is a priority for (unintelligible) organized this as countries but they think this one that has to be solved before any movement towards a new round takes place. So he was very open.

He understood our positions although he couldn't be in the Monday meeting. And I understand that he was going to send a note to all GAC members to participate in this particularly working group so let's hope we get more GAC involvement in our group. Thank you, Heather.

Heather Forrest: No thank you, Carlos. I agree with what's been said and I'll ask staff to chime in before we finish this. I think from my perspective what we did achieve, which is a very significant thing despite the fact that this group - this cross

community working group has been established for more than a year now, I think we've only just now achieved visibility within the GAC in particular but within the broader ICANN community.

There's a high degree of interest across the community in this topic. And sadly the emphasis and the motivation and the input around IANA transition over the past few months has really taken the wind out of everyone else's sail, including ours.

And I think we've finally achieved some community visibility which I would hope will assist our work. And I think as Annebeth says, it's particularly positive development that we have made our way into the GAC communiqué because that at least suggests an acknowledgement outside of one or two GAC members to the broader GAC. We understand that our group has been the topic of discussion within the GAC in terms of preparing the communiqué and I think that that's super helpful and a very significant - a very significant step forward.

Bart, Lars, Marika, anything you would like to add on this on where we are in terms of the ICANN meeting? Your thoughts, was it a success?

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart. Go ahead, Lars. Go ahead.

Lars Hoffman: Yeah, I mean, Bart, you can first. But I think my views - I agree with what the three of you have said and summarized. I think we managed to set ourselves up very nicely for some productive work. Afterwards we received some good input.

And I also think we (unintelligible) as you just said, have a - some new members and interest from other GAC members, the GAC in general but also from the GNSO and the ccNSO. And I think if we take that on board I think

we had a good point to move forward with the strawman that we have at the moment and build on that to hopefully produce something a little bit more substantive for the next meeting in Buenos Aires.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Lars. Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: I just wanted to say that the comments made by Annebeth I will forward them to this group as well. Say, I forwarded them to the GAC secretariat so they have been widely distributed as well. And it, you know, they could be used as a point of reference for everybody.

Heather Forrest: That's very helpful. Bart.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Bart. This is Annebeth again. One more comment on this is that the GAC is also discussing country and territory names and especially two letter codes at the second level domains at the moment. And my impression was that it's a lot of confusion - a confusion among the GAC members as well what we are discussing and what they are discussing also to the level where the geographical names should be used.

So when we are talking about this with anybody it's - I think it's really important that we stress that it's only the country and territory names out of the ISO code and it's only on the first level as a TLD.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Annebeth. I think that's a - it's a helpful clarification. I'm not - I'm not sure if that's necessarily a helpful thing or I don't know if it's a helpful thing or a hindrance, I suppose, the fact that our charter is limited to what it is. Our charter of course is the product of - I suppose, if you like we can perhaps claim to be the very first new gTLD review in a sense.

Our charter really comes out of the new gTLD program and so hence is limited to the top level although Carlos and I have had some discussions about this in the GNSO context. And it may well be a hindrance that we're

limited to the top level because quite frankly any policy, you know, we've set out to develop a policy that's consistent - consistent, coherent and replicable.

And I suppose that we can hope is any recommendations that we make will be - will be more broadly considered as this goes forward. So we'll see. But be that as it may, I agree with Annebeth that it's important that we reiterate (unintelligible) our very limited scope.

With that in mind would anyone like to make any further comments on the ICANN meeting in Singapore and what was done there?

Bart Boswinkel: Heather, this is Bart. I just want to comment on what you just said around the scope of this working group. And I think it was, say, originally limited and after the adoption of the recommendations of the study group it remained limited from a CC perspective. And this is just, say, this - in order for the ccNSO to get involved, say, they - that policy remit or the remit what they do is very limited; it is only limited to say the changes regarding say IANA so the selection of top level domains or ccTLD top level domains in the case of IDNs.

So in order to avoid any confusion with ccTLDs and their own policies, it has to be limited otherwise there could be an implied policy remit for the ccNSO and it will be dealing with say second or lower levels at full - for ccTLDs and which is explicitly out of scope of the ccNSO.

Annebeth Lange: Yeah, I agree with you, Bart.

Heather Forrest: Very good point. Yeah, it's a very good point, Bart, thank you for that. I think that it's an area where the ccNSO and the GNSO differ in their remit and it's a very significant difference. So it's a very helpful - it's a very helpful context to know exactly why it is that our charter was limited the way that it was. So I think that's very helpful.

Any further comments on the meeting? No? I'll offer, again, my thanks to our fantastic ICANN support staff, Bart and Lars and Marika, for keeping us on the goal and in line and for my part I'll say from a housekeeping point of view I thought that that Monday meeting was significantly more conducive to attendance than the Thursday meeting, albeit we don't have a gala on Wednesdays.

I think by the end of the week everyone has hashed issues sufficiently that they sleep in on Monday morning and - or excuse me, Thursday morning, and 8 am Thursday was simply not doing us very much good in terms of getting folks into the room. And I thought we had a much better - a much better run with that with Monday.

So the extent that we as soon as we open up the schedule my vote would be for continuing along the line, I'll certainly - Annebeth or Paul's not on the call but Carlos, if you have any thoughts about the timing of the meeting, by all means, please add them in.

Annebeth Lange: Annebeth here. Yeah, I agree with you, Heather. It is much better to have it in the beginning of the week.

Heather Forrest: I think it set us up for more dialogue throughout the week as opposed to everyone...

Annebeth Lange: Yes.

Heather Forrest: ...was exhausted and this was just kind of a maybe I'll go if I don't sleep in that morning kind of an event so. Excellent. All right well let's move to substance. And let's talk about the - about the strawman options paper that we have in front of us.

Now one thing - and Lars, can you confirm for me did this go around to the whole membership?

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars. Yes, Heather, it went out to the whole membership on Friday I believe.

Heather Forrest: Perfect. Perfect, thank you very much.

Lars Hoffman: And just as a quick - can I just add something very quickly? I'm so sorry.

Heather Forrest: Absolutely.

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: Don't apologize.

Lars Hoffman: I believe that Laura just sent another version with a couple of comments in there onto the redline version. And if you want me to I'll load that up to the (unintelligible) so that's the version that we have up there right now.

Heather Forrest: We could do that. The other thing we could do - well I suppose this is an operational question is what do we want to do? We want to sit and discuss this document, what it might well be is that we compile a bunch of comments that come out of today's discussion and we recirculate after that.

So I really - I'm not - I suppose I'm not bothered about which we do whether we work with the draft that we have in front of us, that we all saw on Friday and then we recirculate after we have comments from today or we can work with the document that we've just received. And it's from Laura...

Lars Hoffman: Hutchison.

Heather Forrest: Oh okay, yeah, yeah. What is everyone inclined to do? Would we like to work with the paper that we have in front of us or would we like to see a more recent version?

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars, Heather. It might be easier actually to work on the clean sheet and I will incorporate comments from today and then add Laura's to that as well and send that around to the - that might be the easiest maybe.

Annebeth Lange: Okay.

Heather Forrest: I'm happy to do that. And I suppose folks may have their own draft that they've written down comments and things like that so perhaps if we work from Friday that is easiest.

One of the things that you'll see on the draft that's been circulated on Friday, and I think is very helpful and we didn't have just for technical issues in Singapore was the explanatory note, if you like, on the front page that gives some background as to what it is that we're doing and why this document has been prepared.

I think we had a good oral summary of that in our meeting in Singapore but this is particularly helpful given that this is a published document and will sit on the record in terms of what we're doing. I think it's very appropriate that we have that explanation.

And that explanation does, picking up the discussion we've just had, does very clearly articulate exactly what this group's scope is and what it is that we've set out to do and what it is that our charter requires us to do.

In terms of delivering on our charter, we've adopted this as a way forward. And I really can't, let's say, under or emphasize at this point that this is a document that's meant to simply be a starting point that the way that this document is set out in that it describes the status quo of policy in relation to particular names, it identifies issues in relation to particular names and then it sets out potential options in relation to particular names.

This is, by no means, a take this as red and agree with it. This is a starting point. There are empty boxes to be filled in relation to each one of these and I hope that the dialogue will continue in that fashion that we won't be somehow constrained. I suppose that's the only risk of using a strawman is that somehow the strawman is considered - is considered the limits of the discussion rather than a starting point for the discussion.

So with that in mind, Lars, or Bart, could you offer some input, some comments for the group on the changes that were made between - perhaps, Lars, you're the driver of the document, changes to the document made since Singapore please.

Lars Hoffman: Sure. This is Lars for the record. So what I've uploaded into the Adobe room is the clean version. On the list I sent out a redline version and a clean version as well. And if you - I'm just going to sync the document. So if you go out here this is the introductory section that is - mainly there has been no changes made to that.

And then if we move on to Page 3 the two-letter country codes I think Jaap is on the line. We had a chat with him, Jaap is an expert about the ISO list and related details and so he pointed out a few errors or incorrectness in this, I should say, in the first draft. And those were taken care of. But no substantive issues have been changed here.

And then in - if we go down - Jaap, you want to add anything to that? You want to make any further explanations before I move on?

Jaap Akkerhuis: This is Jaap for the record. No (unintelligible) and but I open for questions for details (unintelligible) I've just been (unintelligible).

Lars Hoffman: Okay no problem. Thanks for that. Yeah, and then on the - well we Page - the three letter country codes, again, - well I'm just scrolling the redline version. I'm so sorry. I'm just going to grab one issue here. If you see here on Page 5

the burdens and risks, Patrick Jones who's also on the call, and who's the relation with the UN group related here, made some comments on this page that's been added here.

But as I pointed out on the list we put this in as Heather also said earlier, as the starting point for discussions rather than anything else. So the group should go through all these (unintelligible) discussions.

And then on the bottom of the document there's been just some non-substantive changes and a comment, again, from Patrick I believe, on the potential options on Page 9 down here.

And that's it. So there has been really just a few changes up in the first bit under the ISO and then - from Jaap on the ISO issues and then some comments from Patrick and that's it really. So we're haven't moved forward a great deal since then.

Heather Forrest: That's helpful, Lars. Thank you. I suppose the point to emphasize here is that the changes that have been made since Singapore have been to achieve, let's say, greater - if I may say so, accuracy as a starting point. In terms of our specific remit, let's say, in terms of the ISO list and in terms of the UN list then this helps us to clarify the baseline, if you like.

So at the moment the document that everyone had seen is substantively unchanged in terms of comments from members around our precise plan for how we take this forward.

So with that in mind, I suppose what we agreed in Singapore was to start with the two letter country codes. I think there's all sorts of good reasons for starting at that point, and see how we go in terms of options.

I don't think necessarily, although we can add some comments to - or perhaps we do, perhaps we take it section by section. At this point does

anyone have any concerns about or additions to any of the points that were raised in terms of the status quo? I think the key points there being that two letter strings are designated for use as ccTLDs. This is a policy that's been in place since the initial delegation of ccTLDs at ICANN's formation.

And that largely, let's say, where we are and it's certainly where the Applicant Guidebook drew its policy from in restricting applications for new gTLDs in two letter strings.

Annebeth Lange: Heather, this is Annebeth. Could I just comment with a suggestion that it's - when we had this paper - and, Lars, this is a question to you as well - so is it possible that I see that Laura has made her comments on this paper and sent this by mail and perhaps other people have some ideas and some comments that they could put in a kind of review mode and send it to you. Is that a possible way to do it?

Because I think it might be some differences in opinions in some of these. Perhaps not in the status quo but we come to the benefit and (unintelligible) it certainly will be different opinions. So what do you think? How shall we do it?

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars. Thank you, Annebeth.

Heather Forrest: Yeah, go for it, Lars.

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: I was going to say over to you, Lars, yeah.

Lars Hoffman: Thanks, Heather. I mean, whatever you think would work best for you. I'm very happy for you to make changes in the Word document, use strike changes, and then to combine the various comments received into one master document. I think that might be possibly the easiest way but if there's

anything else you prefer then, you know, I'm open to suggestions. But that's usually how we do it.

Heather Forrest: Lars, this is Heather. Given that we'll have different comments on different points, let's say, perhaps where we have different versions or options of the same point rather than run all of the edits into that single point perhaps we have Option 1, Option 2, Option 3.

I know we've done that new gTLD policy development. Is, you know, to the extent that a single one of these potential solutions or whatever it is, potential options, has multiple comments that we simply do - we simply do different versions of the same comment rather than try and run them all together.

((Crosstalk))

Lars Hoffman: Oh yeah, absolutely.

Annebeth Lange: Yeah.

Heather Forrest: Good, good. And, Annebeth, my - this is Heather. My thinking is that we're probably in a position - I agree with you certainly when we come to the potential options - my thinking is we can discuss today, given that I don't think it would be nearly as controversial, the status quo, that we can have that discussion over the phone.

And that we should be able to discuss some of the issues today, not to say we seek agreement on them but that we identify particular things as issues and put them on the table as particular issues. And I agree with you that we may not - indeed may not even have time to discuss the potential options. Perhaps that, given the complexity, is a better issue for doing in writing at this stage that people are able to offer their first thoughts in writing as opposed to...

Annebeth Lange: Yeah.

Heather Forrest: ...as opposed to spoken. If that - if you're comfortable with that then if we're able to perhaps we, you know, we focus our discussion today on Part A and Part B, the status quo and the issues.

Annebeth Lange: Yeah, I agree.

Heather Forrest: Okay.

Lars Hoffman: I think Bart has his hand up.

Heather Forrest: Bart, please. Apologies.

Bart Boswinkel: This is the second time people see the document. And, Lars, did we change the purpose statement a little bit or didn't we? I think we refined it a little bit. But in order to ensure that, say, people on the working group all agree on the purpose statement of this document, it might be good to make this - turn this to - into a kind of, yeah, quote unquote decision because then we have at least one section that is complete. We may need to revisit it at some point. But then moving forward so you have a solid starting point.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. I think that's helpful, Bart. I wasn't aware that we have made changes in the purpose section so where what have we done that? And then I'll be happy to put that forward to the group.

Bart Boswinkel: Lars, did we or didn't we? I can't recall.

Lars Hoffman: I didn't think we have, Bart, not since Singapore.

Bart Boswinkel: No, but so this would be the second call for this - or the second reading of this part of the document. And there's...

Annebeth Lange: This is Annebeth. I don't think so. Didn't we - just before Singapore we added something to the purpose that took in something from the study group.

((Crosstalk))

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars. I'm sorry. It was added before the face to face meeting. Heather made some updates.

Heather Forrest: Yes, yes.

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: Not everybody was there at the face to face meeting.

Lars Hoffman: Absolutely not.

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: This particular part of the document was not discussed in Singapore. So this actually isn't a second viewing for this part of the document, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Heather Forrest: So I suppose then as a point of order we need to step back one and say - I suppose we invite this for comment around the purpose. It's good, apologies, I jumped into the substance, that we talk about the purpose to the extent that anyone has any questions or concerns around the purpose.

And it would really be our next meeting when we could confirm this part when we'd have a second viewing of this section of the document. So specifically referring to Page 1 of the document entitled Cross Community Working Group on Country and Territory Names as Top Level Domains. Strawman Option Paper. And we have the section entitled Purpose, which is the

purpose of the document, not the - necessarily the purpose of our group, although of course the two overlap.

And CWG next steps so this sets out what the document intends to achieve. Does anyone have any initial thoughts on this as we are now - now this is a - these two sections of the paper were put together very much as a collaborative effort of the co-chairs. It's something we worked on prior to Singapore and really in the run up to Singapore in the last two weeks. And as I say, for all sorts of technical reasons, we didn't manage to print this part out to have circulated in Singapore so this is the first time that folks are seeing this.

I don't think, if I offer this as a sort of headline, I don't think that the co-chairs - I'll speak for myself at least - found this to be a terribly controversial section of the document. We relied very heavily on the charter of the group and simply articulating as clearly as possible what the charter required our group to do and how we understood that as a mandate for moving forward and how we thought this approach could specifically be helpful for moving forward.

Anyone have any comments at this stage? All right what I propose we do - I think Bart is very good at keeping us on track. What I propose that we do is that members of the group consider this and specifically consider the language around the purpose and the CWG next steps.

And we will as a point of order in the agenda, and Lars, I would be grateful if you could note that for us in our next agenda - seek agreement from the group that we are satisfied with those two sections of this particular document. And that will give us a solid platform for moving forward.

We've agreed to clarify, and for those who weren't available to attend in Singapore, we have agreed with the general concept of what we're doing. It's the specific articulation of that concept I think that we're seeking agreement

on in the form of that language. So I don't feel that we're hampered in going forward in our discussion into...

Bart Boswinkel: No, not all.

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: ...Section 1 Part A we have agreed that this is how well proceed. Any further - any concerns about that, about the front end of the document? If not we'll go back to my jumping ahead, let's say to the status quo on two letter country codes. Good.

All right, in terms of the - in terms of the status quo then as previously said, this largely has to do with ccTLDs. One of the discussions that we had within the group was around including in the status quo reasons and justifications. Given that we will be, if not required by the community, certainly accountability suggests that we should be providing reasons for the outcome of whatever we achieve in the CWG.

I thought it would be very helpful to have the reasons or justifications for the status quo to the extent that this has been articulated set out in this document as a baseline, Number 1, to prompt us to provide our own reasons; Number 2, to provide us with something to look back and understand why the policy is what it is currently so hence the inclusion of this section.

And in some cases, I'll say this just for my own - for my own research in this area, what I've discovered is that in many cases particularly early decisions around the very early ICANN, 1999, 2000 there weren't decisions - or decisions weren't recorded.

Things were somehow justified on basis that were understood by those who made the decision but the documentation simply wasn't kept. And a good example of this and where you see this actually articulated is a previous

group that I think has some very strong alignment with what it is we're trying to do which looks at excluded names and/or reserve names, the reserve names working group.

And the report by that group I think is pretty helpful. We've had a look at that report in developing this document just in terms of how that group went about evaluating what it was doing. And that group was set out - it was really chartered to look at exclusions and reservations in light - in a very early light of the new gTLD program to determine whether or not those should be perpetuated in the new gTLD program.

And what that group found, rather remarkably, was with some things, for example, reservation of the word - that's a terrible choice of phrase what I've said - but the reservation of the word "example" reservation of two letter codes, reservation of these sorts of things, that the group found there really isn't any recorded justification for why that was done.

In some cases reservations were identified for technical reasons, for user confusion reasons and in some cases that working group said we assume that these things were reserved for technical reasons or for confusion prevention but we don't know because that wasn't actually recorded.

So that's just something to bear in mind as we look at this draft document in many cases the reasons and justification section at the moment are pretty scanty. And I think what we need to do is dig back collectively in our own minds as well as in the record to try and understand why it is that the current policy is what it is.

So with that in mind...

Annebeth Lange: Heather, this is Annebeth.

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: I think that two letter codes should actually be in the more easy one compared with the rest of the thing we're going to discuss because if you think back historically also what did - why did Jon Postel make gTLDs and ccTLDs was the reason behind that separation between these two groups. And in my mind it's more like the - for example then Norway that dotNo is the Norwegian corner of the Net the same way as we have plus 47 for our telephone way.

So - and the world has been very used to have two letters in that - to look at it as a more identification of a country and territory area. And the more letters then it's more commercial TLDs. So for me at least the user confusion will be the most - the heaviest argument.

Heather Forrest: And this is Heather. Annebeth, I agree from a GNSO perspective as well, and you'll see the comments that are in the - in the reasons and justification section here that refer to the reserve names working group report that - that was then adopted by the GNSO in its new gTLD policy development - that approach that we understood.

And historically, I suppose, the only thing that's missing from this statement is that there was always acknowledge early on a certain dynamism in the - in the UN list on which the - oh perfect, Patrick I see your comment - and Patrick is of course an excellent person to speak to this point.

There's always been acknowledged a dynamism in the UN list on which the ccTLDs are based - from which ccTLDs can be derived. And there are some excellent examples of changes to the list and it's always been, let's say, a concern - Jaap is saying there is. Well, ccTLDs are based on the designation of countries by the UN. Jaap, would you like...

((Crosstalk))

Jaap Akkerhuis: Not necessarily. Not necessarily. And (unintelligible) there is - I mean, (unintelligible) and it comes into statistical office the list N94 from the statistical office in UN. It's (unintelligible) code but it's not necessarily that is the only reason (unintelligible) two letter codes exist. And (unintelligible) list of two letter codes. (Unintelligible) the list of the statistical office of the UN has the list of what are used for (unintelligible) statistical reports.

For that (unintelligible) ISO and ask for a code. So the code is not assigned by the UN. That's - they use it a lot but there are (unintelligible) for getting a code and (unintelligible) although it's a little bit hidden in history but there's a separate code for Taiwan and (unintelligible) N49 number.

The (unintelligible) for the (unintelligible) which has a number but is not carrying a code. So there is not a list defined by the UN, I mean - and I really want to be careful about this because people often (unintelligible) the ISO list is that (unintelligible) recognized by the UN and now they want a code. And then they are recognized by (unintelligible) UN but they're not a member of the UN. So be careful about, I mean, how you define this.

Heather Forrest: Understood. Thank you. Thank you, Jaap. And...

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: ...reference to the ISO as opposed to the UN. Yes.

Jaap Akkerhuis: But (unintelligible) confusion about this (unintelligible) discussions and I really want to be precise. And the other thing is that although - there has been for years and if I remember correctly from '81 to '84 or whatever, the discussion with Postel and some - some of the other people about, I mean, (unintelligible) and so the Internet didn't exist. At that time there were discussions about maybe for (unintelligible) networks and especially (unintelligible) network of the (unintelligible).

It was defined top level domains and for quite a couple of years after (unintelligible) there was a discussion which - how to define (unintelligible) country used. And (unintelligible) confused by the fact that there are two letter codes for a US state but they were actually moved from table in (unintelligible).

The big discussion at that time was in the end Postel (unintelligible) it's not the work of the - of Postel to define what a country is it should be an outside source. And (unintelligible) two and three letter codes (unintelligible), you've got (unintelligible) committee. You have lots of (unintelligible). If you really look you can easily find 12 slightly different lists. And in the end it was decided that ISO was probably going to be the most (unintelligible) dotUK came into existence because (unintelligible) really wanted to get ahead.

And (unintelligible) complete (unintelligible) dotUK was actually moved for some time and two letter codes (unintelligible) because by that time dotCom and dotInt was well very existing, dotCom was the three letter code (unintelligible) and the two letter codes were not (unintelligible).

So at that (unintelligible) it was allowed to have (unintelligible) ISO list. And so UK was unceremoniously removed from the Internet and after a lot of protests we added (unintelligible) or so and - but that's actually the start of using the ISO codes.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Jaap. That's extremely helpful context. And now I recall...

((Crosstalk))

Jaap Akkerhuis: ...I would say - being said before there's not a lot actually been written down. I lost my backup date for (unintelligible) because I was part of the discussion at that time for a little while. And so I came (unintelligible) I think (unintelligible) Postel (unintelligible) which I don't really know. And so it's all

by memory and everybody's (unintelligible) different perception about what really happened.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Jaap. I recall distinctly the comments that I suppose summarizes those discussions, Jon Postel that says ICANN or IANA is not in the business of deciding who or what is a country and that of course led to the outside source.

With that in mind, then, we have - we have I think the possibility of capturing a bit more of that context here in the reasons and the justifications so that we don't simply, I suppose, perpetuate any misconceptions about the reliance on the ISO list and why that occurred.

I think it would be very helpful to capture some more of that dialogue here in order to inform our discussion. This is a very good opportunity, I suppose, Jaap, to the extent that there is confusion around this to ameliorate that confusion, I suppose. We have a document that will be published and this would be a very good forum for doing that to the extent that we wish to clear the record then I think that would be helpful.

So, Jaap, if you're willing to work with us to refine this section a bit further particularly given your personal experience in this I think that would be very helpful.

Jaap Akkerhuis: I will try. And I will try to find in other (unintelligible) to produce anything more substantial because I was not really that much involved at that time and (unintelligible). And - but let me see what I can dig up. I mean, my colleague at that time who was there involved didn't have anything really on paper either so.

Heather Forrest: That would be very helpful I think as we bring that forward. And if you do have information to add I suppose it would be helpful if you could simply circulate it to the list and, Lars, if you're able to pick that up we can work on

incorporating that into the document. Excellent. I think that's a very helpful - a very helpful addition to where we are.

Anyone have any further comments on the (unintelligible) comments in the chat about Section A, the status quo. All right...

Carlos Gutierrez: Yes, Heather, if I may?

Heather Forrest: Yes please. Please, Carlos.

Carlos Gutierrez: Yes, this is Carlos for the record. Thank you, Jaap, this is very interesting. And I would like to go back to the purpose of the working group and the purpose is to get away from lists and look for general framework. So I think the - what I listened from Jaap is the history of some (unintelligible) and we should bring the history to a footnote because this list were used for statistical purposes first and, second, for direction in calls like Annebeth said, you need a code to direct the call in the legacy system of the phone service.

So I think we have to make emphasis in that we are using now these codes not as codes, not as statistics but we are using them as names. Two letter codes are difficult to recognize as names but as we go into three letter and short names we are in the names realm. And I will be glad to look at what Jaap sends us and what Lars can do with that.

And I'm ready to work with them. I think we have to change the focus from the list because if we have a bias is that we are not planning to come out with a list like the GAC is proposing. So I think it's very appropriate that we (unintelligible) the beginning of this paper to set this focus away from the list. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Carlos, I think that's very helpful. And what that underlines for me is that in order for us to have a fulsome discussion about Part B, the issues, we really need to - I suppose we need to work sequentially through this document. We

need to have a good solid understanding of Part A which is the status quo because it's really only with a full and comprehensive understanding of the status quo, including those reasons and justification, that we'll be able to identify all of the potential issues.

And I characterize what you've just said, Carlos, as an issue, yes? As a here's a problem or a question or a challenge that arises out of the status quo. So what I would suggest that we do - and very good timing given the time, is to wrap up our discussion here and say that we will do two things between now and our next call.

Number 1, we'll look at the purpose and the CWG next steps part of the document to the extent any changes are requested or any ideas come out of that that those please be circulated. And, Number 2 will focus on this developing the status quo section in relation to two letter - two letter country codes that that will then facilitate further discussion in our next call if you like, agreement or discussion around those things and progressing to the discussion of the issues in Part B.

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: This is Annebeth here.

Heather Forrest: Please, Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Just wanted to make a comment on what Carlos said that even if we are discussing lists now and especially with regard to geographical names as a whole and as long as we're going to keep the different or the system with ccTLDs and gTLDs as two different parts of the Net, in my view the country codes are not only an address, it's a kind of identification as well. So we mustn't forget that part of it.

And we know that in politically a lot of countries have changed during the last 10 years that it's been big geographical areas separated in smaller countries, we know that. And if we use two letter codes and mix the things with gTLDs that's the only thing we have that separates the CCs and the Gs today. So I would be very skeptical and we must be very careful to just jump into something here.

Heather Forrest: Yeah, thank you, Annebeth. And I think, again, that's a comment, let's say, the fulsome discussion around the issues and how we articulate those issues and the concerns that we have around those and we may not, let's say, agree on each of the various points as being an issue, I hesitate to go too much further down that road until we - until we have a better description or a more full description of Part A of the current policy.

Annebeth Lange: Good.

Heather Forrest: Yeah, with that in mind, can we - are we happy with that approach, let's say, that we look at those two sections of the document between now and our next meeting. Lars, may I turn to you, our next meeting, please.

Lars Hoffman: Thanks, Heather. This is Lars. I think we agreed in Singapore to have a meeting every two weeks so that would put the next meeting at Monday the 16th of March. And we rotate the time slot which will make it probably 7 or 8 UTC call on Monday the 16th.

Annebeth Lange: Oh the morning - in the morning, Lars?

Lars Hoffman: Yes. Yes.

Heather Forrest: Yeah.

Lars Hoffman: Yes, Annebeth, in the morning.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, good. Good. That's better.

Heather Forrest: Perfect. So then we have our marching orders for the next meeting. If anyone has any concerns in the meantime please by all means raise them on the list, any comments it would be easiest to deal with the comments by let's say in written comment so to the extent that you have comments let's please circulate those in writing. And, Lars, are you willing to be the task master and compile as we go?

Lars Hoffman: Absolutely, Heather. No problem at all.

Heather Forrest: Wonderful. Thank you very much.

Annebeth Lange: Great, great.

Heather Forrest: Well with that does anyone have any further comments? Hearing none then I thank you all for your participation today and look forward to talking to you in two weeks' time.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay, thank you Heather.

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: Bye now.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye-bye.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you.

END