

ICANN Transcription
Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Country/Territory Names as TLDs
Monday 15 February 2016 at 2100 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Country/Territory Names as TLDs call on the Monday 15 February 2016 at 21:00 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/gnso/gnso-ctn-15feb16-en.mp3>

Attendees:

ccNSO:

Annebeth Lange, .no
Grigori Saghyan, .am
Mirjana Tasic, .rs
Ron Sherwood, .vi
Paul Szyndler, .au (co-Chair)

GNSO

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

At-Large:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr

Other:

Jaap Akkerhuis
Panagiotis Papaspiliopoulos
Sebastien Pensis

Apologies:

Sanna Sahlman, .fi

ICANN staff:
Bart Boswinkel
Lars Hoffman
Joke Braeken
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Lars). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the CWG CTN call on the 15th of February 2016.

On the call today we have Grigori Saghyan, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Carlos Raul Gutierrez, Maxim Alzoba, Sebastian Pensis, Jaap Akkerhuis, Ron Sherwood, Susan Payne, Heather Forrest and Annebeth Lange. We received apologies from Sanna Sahlman. And from staff we have Bart Boswinkel, Lars Hoffmann, Joke Braeken 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 Lars.

Lars Hoffmann: Thank you Nathalie. Welcome everybody. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. I hope this finds you well. It turns out as I woke up this morning it's President's Day in the United States. It was a bank holiday. I wasn't aware. But it was a very nice surprise.

On that note of nice surprises, we had a quick call with the co-Chairs on Friday, with the staff and to discuss a little bit how we can proceed as a group considering that we've receive a variety of responses as you know on the three-character codes but very little discussion following what was a diverse range of (unintelligible) through the feedback requests from the various SO and ACs.

So you've also seen Heather's email that she sent on the 19th or 20th of January this year proposing a way forward. And the replies that have come in on that were largely positive. So we decided to build on that if you want.

And the proposal that's on the table is that staff would take on the pen and we proceed similarly to how we proceeded with the two-character codes being aware that this issue is potentially more contagious and so staff is aware and will be as neutral and balanced as I suppose we always are but even more so this time around and by proposing a strawman paper on the three-character codes - three-character codes, yes.

To be very clear, this is going to be very much intended to start discussions because the feeling was that everybody has kind of an opinion at the moment. They voiced that to the various communities and the feedback request.

And to come up, if you will, with an accurate or potential staffing point for consensus on the call might be very difficult because people obviously to start off with and (unintelligible) their views and rather than maybe being (in touch with) last group, it'd be more difficult to come with a first consensus, if you want, on how we could proceed.

So the idea is that staff will present or write up a paper that is then in no way meant to be the consensus view or a consensus view but a starting point to get people discussing substantive proposals.

And I'd like to point out that obviously various issues that we will take onboard, especially those opinions that were voiced that have a clear rationale why some think that we should proceed one way or another way with three-character codes. But we will not obviously start - we will not add anything. We will be strictly relying on those arguments brought forward by the community.

And so the idea is to have that paper ready for the Marrakech meeting. We will try our very best to have it as early as possible so that some of you might be able to study it or ready it rather on the flight there already.

But, as you know, for yourselves and for staff as well and right up to the meeting, it's always a very busy period. So it might just come on the Friday or the Saturday of the Marrakech meeting bearing in mind that we're to group a meeting on Monday -- I'm sorry -- on Monday at 10:30. Bart has put that also I believe in the agenda there on the right on the third points in the notes.

So that is the proposal to move forward. And so I'm going to pass it back to the group if there's any feedback or any comments on the call they would like to share before we proceed. Thanks. Heather, please go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Hi Lars. Thank you very much for taking the lead this morning and for capturing the discussion that we had amongst the co-Chairs. One point I'll emphasize that I emphasized in this call and I think it's important to emphasize here is the comment that you made about the fact that we're dealing with the feedback or the let's say the feedback that we received on three-letter codes some of it expresses very personal views. Some of it is fairly limited in the justification that's provided.

And following the model of what we did for two-letter codes, I think it's important that as we go through and develop the strawman that we look for those inputs that have a stated rationale go them given that this is a community working group and we need to justify ourselves to the community that we focus, like I say, in particular on trying to elicit.

And it's not going to be an easy job I suppose. Elicit in particular those comments that have a stated rationale. And to the extent that that rationale is consistent or inconsistent with where we've gone with two-letter codes I think we need to bear that in mind. So I'll offer that just as a starting point for the strawman.

And also picking up on the emails that have come in on the list in the meantime, let's say over the past few weeks, we've had a recent submission from the government of Greece and I know there have been perhaps very recently some answers to the three to do points that we sent around after our last call.

I supposed just we can reassure everyone Lars it's possible to take all of that even those recent submissions into consideration. Isn't that correct?

Lars Hoffmann: Yes, that's absolutely correct. Yes. We - you captured it very well. So we're going to be basing this on rationale. We take as much onboard as possible. And there's even the possibility then we might not come up with any specifics but that we're just trying to lay out, you know, what kind of principles the group should take into account and from what possibilities would flow from that. And so it's going to be a step-by-step small step procedure here.

Heather Forrest: Perfect. Thanks Lars.

Lars Hoffmann: Thank you Heather. Anybody else who'd like to chime in at this point? So if there's no other questions or comments, I would - no Annebeth just raised her hand. Annebeth, please go ahead. Annebeth, we can't hear you. I don't know if you're on mute. Annebeth, we still can't hear you if you're speaking.

Annebeth, Nathalie's just saying in the chat that you have to activate your mic, which you might have not done if you just dialed into the AC room and there's a little telephone button at the top. And if you say connect mic, that should do the trick. Annebeth, I think Nathalie just (unintelligible) dial out and it seems you're not actually on the phone bridge.

So I'm just going to take it from here. And then when you're connected, I'll pass it straight over to you if that is okay. I'm just going to move in fact ahead to Marrakech while we get Annebeth on the line hopefully.

As I said earlier and as Bart put in the chat we're going to meet on Monday, the 7th of March from 10:30 to 12:00 noon local time. So that's gives us an hour and a half and hopefully that will be the first time or, you know, that will be the time we're going to discuss the strawman for the first time.

And hopefully you will have -we will do our best to give enough time to read this document as early as possible and give you as much time as possible to prepare for the meeting.

In addition, as you might recall, we're obviously in close connection here with the GAC who has a somewhat adjacent working group. And the GAC originally wanted to reach out to our group and have a joint meeting on the - either the Saturday or the Sunday prior to the opening ceremony on Monday.

And however, due to the CCWG Accountability work that is ongoing and the procedural say challenges that the GAC faces as an organization to come up with consensus views, they have canceled that meeting last minute. So we're not going to be meeting with the GAC at this meeting but it's penciled in with a permanent marker for ICANN 56 or at least that's what I've been told. So that's something to look forward to.

And if I can add to that, I think it would be also good to - a good idea, and the co-Chairs agreed with that on Friday, to once we have a strawman and we're feeling kind of confident that we are on the right path, it doesn't have to be necessarily completed or agreed upon by everybody.

Once you kind of see where this is going to expressly reach out to the GAC and not just with our members to this group to bring it back but actually to forward the strawman to the GAC leadership so they can distribute it among their mailing list and ensure that everybody has been at least informed and there can be no complaining about a lack of information our group towards

them. I think that might be a useful step but that's obviously a couple of weeks in the future.

That is everything from me. Annebeth, have you managed to come on? Nathalie just said in the chat that dialing out to Annebeth. And Heather also just raised her hand so I'm going to put Heather up first and then hopefully we have Annebeth on the line. Heather, please go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Lars. Yes, while we wait for Annebeth just a very quick comment. I think it's an interesting point that you raised about us keeping the GAC Working Group as informed as we can.

I wouldn't like the - I wouldn't like the charge to be reversed. Let's say one of my personal frustrations I suppose with the GAC Working Group is that all of that work happens in secret and we don't have anyone - let's say there's no opportunity for any one of us or all of us to join that group in its work.

So to the extent that we can keep them as informed as possible - and am I right in thinking there was an opportunity in Marrakech but that's not now going to go ahead for them to advise us and vice versa.

Lars Hoffmann: Okay. Thank you Heather. Annebeth, I think you're on now.

Annebeth Lange: I'm here. Yes, I'm here now. Can you hear me? Can you hear me?

Lars Hoffmann: Loud and clear. Please go ahead.

Annebeth Lange: Okay. Good, good, good. It's really a problem down here in Montenegro by the sea. I just wanted to chime in with Heather. I think it's very important that we get - it's very complicated all the things that we're getting.

What it shows is that it's a great diverse view from different stakeholders. And as Heather said, it's some of it is based on rationale now from stakeholders. Others are more personal views.

But the main thing in my view we should (unintelligible) the rationale and also to show and visualize that it is really a quite wide view of different opinions here. And that might be as someone also put in their response to the three-letter - the three questions we asked that it might be difficult to find consensus on this difficult question.

But then our job is also to show the different views and to say that it's difficult to find a consensus, not try to everything (it's worth) to press forward a consensus that - and that's not there.

And also I think Heather was right in connection with the GAC. I have understood the same way that it won't be anything with GAC as they talked about. Is that right Lars?

Lars Hoffmann: Come again. I didn't quite hear (you). The GAC - what was the question about the GAC?

Annebeth Lange: They - we had planned a meeting with the GAC but as I understood you on the last call that it was not to be after all. Is that right?

Lars Hoffmann: Yes, yes. Yes. Sorry Annebeth. Yes. I think I...

Annebeth Lange: Yes.

Lars Hoffmann: ...mentioned it before probably even...

Annebeth Lange: Yes.

Lars Hoffmann: ...the (unintelligible). Yes. So they...

Annebeth Lange: Yes. Yes.

Lars Hoffmann: ...referred to a meeting Friday or Saturday - Saturday or Sunday this meeting but due to...

Annebeth Lange: Okay.

Lars Hoffmann: ...accountability, it'll be postponed for ICANN 56. And I can - and just - I completely agree with what you said. I appreciate that this strawman has to be very much (staged). We have to be clear and, you know, all of staff is aware that we put in the various views and rationales that's been presented.

And so that really needs to be out there that people understand what are the various views. And then hopefully from there we can formulate something that is somewhat acceptable as to content - position or at least as a starting position for discussion.

And I - we are really aware that this is not going to be straightforward and just a matter of, you know, probably pasting a few paragraphs together. So we'll try our best to make this as transparent and as understandable as possible.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you Lars.

Lars Hoffmann: Thank you Annebeth. I think we just have - a hand raised -- I'm sorry -- from (unintelligible). Sorry. That was actually - he was actually trying to get into the AC room rather than raising his hand. So that was my fault.

If there's nothing else, then I will give you back 42 minutes of your day. And I will also just before we close this out, two more things. What we discussed in the call that kind of had a strawman (kind of) into Marrakech. And I will put - Bart has put in the notes and we'll send this around on the list so that

everybody who was on the call today is obviously aware of that. They don't have to listen to the recording necessarily.

And furthermore, I will see you all in Marrakech. There's no more meetings before then because in two weeks from now I think we're going to be - all be traveling already. So the next time we'll talk would be in Palmeraie Resort. Unless there's anybody else who would like to speak at this point. Going once. Going twice. All right. Thank you very much everybody.

Woman: Thank you.

Lars Hoffman: End the recording please.

Woman: Thanks Lars.

Woman: Yes. And see you all in Marrakech.

Lars Hoffman: See you in Marrakech. That's right. (Oh my gosh).

Woman: Thanks everyone.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much for your help today Lars. You may now stop the recording. This concludes today's call.

Woman: Thank you.

END