**Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Country/Territory Names as TLDs
TRANSCRIPT
Monday, 30 March 2015 at 19:00 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-30mar15-en.mp3
On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#mar

Attendees:

ccNSO
Annebeth Lange, .no
Mirjana Tasic, .rs
Laura Hutchison, .uk
Grigori Saghyan, .am
Jacqueline Morris, .tt
Ron Sherwood, .vi

GNSO
Heather Forrest, IPC (Co-Chair)
Carlos Raul Guttierez, NPOC
Maxim Alzoba, NTAG
Colin O'Brien, IPC
Susan Payne, IPC

At-Large
Cheryl Langdon-Orr

ISO
Jaap Akkerhuis

Apologies:
Joke Braeken, .eu

ICANN staff:
Marika Konings

Mary Wong
Lars Hoffmann
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the CWG on Country and Territory names as TLDS on the 30th of March, 2015.

On the call today we have Carlos Raul Gutierrez, Annebeth Lange, Heather Forrest, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Grigori Saghyan, Maxim Alzoba, Mirjana Tasic, Jaap Akkerhuis, Susan Payne and Laura Hutchinson.

I have an apology from Joke Braeken

From staff we have Lars Hoffman, Marika Konings, Mary Wong and myself Terri Agnew. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you very much and back over to you Carlos.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you everybody for showing up in great numbers for this group.

We have been going around the document for the last few meetings and we have it in front of us again.

I would like to mention that in this version of the document which I just sent last night I have included very what I think are very valuable comments by (Jaap) on the history of the use of country codes as TLDs.

(Jaap) I tried to give this as minimal as possible my edits but I think it's very worthwhile looking at those comments.

So I divided the background into three stages, what (Jaap) provided on the codes, what the ccNSO study did two years ago and what we are trying to do.

And having said that my idea was to make some comments on this background but I don't have the paper on the screen right now. It was just one or two pages PowerPoint.

But my suggestion is to ask the group if they think we have to go again through all these (unintelligible) sections or if we can go straight to the discussion of the options which are in Table 4 later in the document please.

Annebeth Lange: Carlos, this is Annebeth. I just have one comment to the definitions of country and territory names and that is chapter definitions.

And it starts with the expressions country name and names of the states have been used interchangeably.

I agree on that. But the ISO code list in the 3166 also comprises - comprise the territory names. And this definition of territory go a little further than the names the states.

And as we - I think we have talked about this before the origin of the ISO code that it was radio stations in different places in the world under some states. And that's the reason why some countries states, some states actually had more than one country code.

We know that France has a lot of country codes since they have a lot of islands out in the Pacific Ocean.

And also Norway have two more cc and TLD codes for (Bovey) Island and Scarborough on (Mayan). And the reason behind that is the radio station origin.

So I think it might be useful to try to explain that the territories in the ISO 3166 and connection is not the same as regions and other parts of countries like Patagonia and which has been very relevant in the discussion lately. It's only the territories that been given the two letter codes by the ISO.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Thank you. Thank you very much Annebeth. I put forward the definition that we took from a WIPO paper that Lars was so kind to distribute recently.

I'm aware that it's short of the territories and we should keep track of this of your comments.

And I put it forward for one reason mainly which is that to make us aware that we have codes, full names different languages, names in the regional (unintelligible), et cetera, et cetera.

And I see no problem to extend it to your explanation of two territories. (Jaap) would you like to comment on this?

(Jaap):   Yes I will. When the ISO 1366 started out as to try to combine multiple list. It's not only - I mean radio stations are actually might be one of them.

But it's more important for territories IS 32 also the list of the at that time UPU to prevent the mail going between two islands in the Caribbean via Paris and can go directly to interchange of mail.

And the other list which is incorporated in ISO 3266 is the list of what you call the list of road signs. You note that if you actually go to ISO 3166 you will notice that a couple of these old codes are actually just over basically served and with the full through be served for (rail line).

So I mean it's not - the reasons of the 3166 is actually a combination of multiple lists.

((Crosstalk))

(Jaap):   And by the way Patagonia is nowhere mentioned there at all because it's not a sub authority. It's actually it's a geographical name which is in a couple different countries.

Anyway and that's why this whole debate Patagonia is just you really have to watch that because I mean there are other geographical names people are trying to use which have - and which are (unintelligible).

I mean Amazon is similar like that. I mean Amazon is also multiple countries so and Peru claims it as well. Not so you have to really careful the examples one uses.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Thank you (Jaap). No, I'm aware that we're talking about political entities even if there is don't have their own government as the territories might imply.

Heather I know I have made some changes in the structure of the paper. I would like to hear your comments?

Heather Forrest: Thank you Carlos. No it was really more a general comment let's say. I haven't yet had a chance in detail to look at the changes that you have made but it's more to point out to the group and follow-up from the message that Lars sent around a few days ago to say that following on the last meeting that we had we had some discussion in that meeting about clarifying the structure of the document including at the front end of the document an explanation of definitions which is what we're discussing now.

We had a discussion around including a section on methodology, how the report had been prepared. And I pushed this forward by preparing a draft that then went to the co-chairs.

And it's really just to say that the changes that were initially made I think it's the documents moved on a bit in preparation for today's call.

But they were not substantive in nature. They were presentation in nature and a sense that it was simply an effort to make the document structure more readable and to provide for a clear representation of this additional information including the background information that we're discussing now so that folks understand how this document which looks very different from the document we looked at in the last meeting how this has come about.

And again the intention was not the co-chairs modified the document and there's been no discussion or agreement let's say in relation to content or substance.

But we did work together to modify the structure of the document. So if anyone has any concerns with the structure of the document please raise those as well. Thanks Carlos.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Thank you. Heather. (Jaap) please? (Jaap) are you raising your hand? Okay. It was an old hand. Annebeth, please?

Annebeth Lange: Annebeth here. I just wanted to support Heather in the way she has structured the document. It's much easier now to see and to understand.

So it's a good way forward. And I agree Heather you haven't changed anything of the materials. You just - or the content. It's just structured in a much better way.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Thank you Annebeth. So we have it in front of us and I agree with what Heather has explained. We have improved the history let's say with the help of (Jaap) first and with a very specific quotes of the ccNSO study group.

I think those two elements are very important because that's where we are coming from.

And in my view what we are challenged with is to consider stepping away from simple lists. We have also discussed that making a finite list of countries and territories is quite a challenge. And I think the charter is clear that we should work on a general framework.

So after the background we have these methodological issue how we should go forward there. The definition list is up for grabs. We haven't put many definitions in the front and we certainly have to work on that.

And I just push forward this first definition of country names living outside territories using the WIPO document. And then we have to start discussing what we have the ISO list with two or three letter codes and the actual names.

And so my suggestion was to go straight from here to look at these option tables that the document has developed further down and try to see from there if we are on the right track for a new methodology.

So if there is no other comment to structure I would suggest that we just jump in the water and go to the first table. Lars please?

And this is the definition list. As you see this is very, very short. And I just quoted this definition of names of states that we found in these documents so we know what we are dealing with and what we are excluding issues like Patagonia and Amazon are of course out.

Nevertheless, the document I think is very interesting this WIPO document because countries have used their names to promote different things from tourism to export of bananas. In the case of Costa Rica you can see it in the document so that sometimes country names are used for business purposes.

But we can continue down please exactly. So here we are on the analysis of the potential options that we have. And I think it's very useful to try to jump into the discussion.

I was not exactly involved in this table. I don't know if staff wants to make a comment of on this or if we should just jump into boxes one after another?

Hello? Is everybody there?

Lars Hoffman: Carlos this is Lars.

Heather Forrest: Hello?

Lars Hoffman: I think Heather just raised her hand.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: I don't see - oh I'm sorry. Here, I'm sorry.

Heather Forrest: I'm happy to comment Carlos. No that's fine.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Okay please Heather go ahead.

Heather Forrest: One thing to say about this is the few options that are in this table - and by no means there are six boxes here. By no means was this a suggestion that there are only six so that there should be six just to clarify that.

These were really bashed in, in the initial draft of the document to have some almost sample text to put in. So I wouldn't like us to consider that to take this text as read.

This hasn't been crafted, collaboratively. This is just text that has been dropped into the document as a placeholder if you like.

So I really think there is some method here not just in going to the boxes one by one and signing them off unless that is truly what we're comfortable with.

I think there needs to be a full frank and open discussion about what the options are and not worry so much about the wordsmithing on the fly.

And let's say let's not worry about exactly how the options get articulated in this sort of a table and really just have a discussion and open discussion about what the options could be is my suggestion as to how we proceed.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Okay thank you very much Heather. I think the - I already implied the discussion of the list and we have a list. We have a well-founded list but there are other lists.

There the list is very flexible in so far the ISO 3166 list is flexible. And so far that it has two or three letter codes.

Then their other codes that countries uses for other purposes and so on.

And for me the question is if can we step away of lists in this new round? 1984 they just took the ISO list and they started using it.

And somehow nobody stopped using it until we found through a lot of flexibility in the use of individual letters in two or three or four.

And the question is should we go list path or should we go to a broader conceptual path? Annebeth please?

Annebeth Lange: Annebeth Lange here. Well I think it's - this is the only list that exists that mentions the country and territory names as being the basis for the system that (John Pusel) made in the beginning to divide between the global TLDs and the TLDs assigned in a way to each country just like I think that his thought was more like as we have in the telephone world we have plus 47,

plus 45 you have your corner of the telephone numbers and then you have your corner or your territory of the domain names.

And the intention in the beginning at least was to use it as to take care of the local intranet communities needs.

And this is the only list that has been used for all these years. And to go away from that list I would be very skeptical to do that.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: I want to clarify Annebeth. I'm not saying we should go away from the list the list stands and it has a reserved multiple combinations of letters.

The list is a little bit inefficient insofar as it is blocked more combinations then there are countries but let's leave it on the side.

I mean the letters, the two letters are blocked by this list so to say. So there is some combinations that don't apply to countries that some people might use but let's leave that on the side.

What our task is okay how do we deal with three letter codes? How do we deal with names? How do we deal with names in different languages, country names in different languages?

I'm not suggesting that the list should be changed. The list stands and the actual codes are reserved. There is a little bit of inefficiency yes. And now how do we step into a more general concept of how to deal with country names on the - on top of lists if you allow me to say. Thank you. Heather or Annebeth you want to react to my comment?

Annebeth Lange: No, just a comment. I'm I see what you mean. So I agree that the longer we get down or the more extension we have the difficult the more difficult the problem is of course it is. So I understand your view here.

But as for not using the hole that it's a lot of combinations that's not being used today we see as the way the world is today as with all these political things going on in the world we know that some countries are changing to or dividing into several countries and other countries are going together.

So we don't know what two letter codes we can use in the future. And if we use that - those two letter codes not used for country today we will take away the possibility for new establish countries in the future to have their two letter codes.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Thank you Annebeth. Heather?

Heather Forrest: Thank you Carlos this is Heather Forrest. I just want to be absolutely clear as to where we're going with this discussion in terms of when you say Carlos we want to move away from lists.

And I think we're also now using the term country and territory names. We're not at right now we're not at the discussion of names.

We will get there but we're not there. At the moment were simply at codes.

And I think the point that Annebeth and Laura make is a good one in the sense that we have an established norm if you like. Let's not call it a list. We have an established norm within ICANN within the policy framework year which is to say that ICANN, you know, very often cited quote ICANN is not in the business of deciding what is a country?

And it's referred to an external organization. And it uses the framework that's developed by the external organization.

And that external organization in this instance is the ISO. And the - just so we're absolutely clear on this first point what we're doing is we're trying to

decide as a CWG what the treatment should be and if there is, you know, if there is treatment what it is in relation to country codes.

So hence I think we need to be careful with the use of country names here. We're not talking about names at the moment. We're talking about country codes.

Now I understand the semantics here. I understand that we have to know what a country is an order to know what the code is.

However I - yes I don't want us to stray into names at this point because we're not there.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Thank you Heather. I agree with all of you everything less than four letters is a code and we're talking only about codes and we're not abolishing the list of codes.

And nevertheless the discussion here is there a general principle to work on codes and country names other than lists for future purposes. We are not going to avoid any lists. Thank you.

So (Jaap) says that there are also four letter codes. Okay I'm sorry about that. That was not the right way to approach counting the letters. Heather please?

Heather Forrest: Thank you Carlos. I suppose a - it - a starting point if we throw things on the table then we can say and I think that was what was behind these yes, strawman in the truest sense, these strawman options that were put into the table.

One option is to keep things exactly the same. You know, to keep things exactly as they are, simply maintain the status quo.

We would need to then - and I would say at this point not necessarily talk about the burdens or the benefits of that. But it's one option that's and is the easiest to identify let's say.

Another one is to say we all abolish all protection and we have an open registration of two letter gTLDs.

Another option would be to maintain the status quo with ISO 3166 and add an additional framework on top of that.

And another option would be to unhinge ourselves from the ISO 3166 list which I think is in the discussion we're having now is perhaps not a favorite option but let's put it on the table so that the table is complete and it's clear that we have discussed it.

And I do think that's a very important point that anyone who reads this document after the fact can see that a particular option has been discussed and been turned down by the group for stated reasons that, you know, we drop the ISO list and we come up with some other formula by which codes are evaluated.

Now in this discussion that we're having about three and four letter codes and whatnot I think we're in interesting territory here insofar as I would want to go back to our charter.

In this particular section of the document what we're considering is ISO codes and what we do with the ISO two letter codes. And the next section is ISO three letter codes.

To the extent that we're opening things up to other codes we need to go back in and look at our charter and indeed unhinging ourselves from the ISO 3166 list, we need to go back to our charter and see if that - see how that impacts

the charter because as it stands now the way this is articulated is we're considering the use of ISO 3166-2 codes.

So if we're opening things up here then I think that needs to be explored before we go down before we go down the road. Annebeth I see your comment here. I just want to be absolutely sure.

I don't know necessarily that our charter mandates us to look at exactly what we're looking at now.

It might just be the names and codes. It might even just be names in relation to country and territories.

So, you know, it just to be absolutely clear what we are purportedly looking at in this document based on its heading is the use of ISO 3166-2 codes.

This discussion about, you know, come away from the ISO list is a bit silly in that context because unless the option is unrestricted registration because, you know, that is our - that is what we set our self up to do here is consider the use of ISO 3166-2.

So I think we need to be precise, go back to the original documents and see have we just fallen into this trap? It's possible. Forgive me, I'm thinking as I speak.

But have we fallen into the trap that we've mentioned ISO 3166-2 because that's what the study group did because that's what some other group did? I'm not sure.

In any event we started off by considering the precise question what do we do with ISO 3166-2? So we ought to deal with that question. I'm confident it's within scope. But then to the extent that we broaden the list and say other

country codes then by some other reference whether it's ISO or something else then that is to be considered.

So perhaps this is my public service announcement for even further precision. And let's limit this discussion to exactly what the heading is which is how do we want to use ISO 3166-2 codes? Thank you.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Thank you Heather. If I go back to the background that (Jaap) gave us my follow-up question would be should we reserve the list and make it official, take all the codes and reserve them in the root and say it's okay, those are blocked, if they are used or not, we don't know but they are going to be blocked.

And (Jaap) had a suggestion that one of the most recent RFCs would go in that direction. That would be not exactly the status quo meeting that we go outside to a list that we don't control and that might change and say okay we internalize the ISO 3166 list in a way or another by making it by blocking those names.

Heather you want to comment again or is this? Heather? (Jaap), please.

(Jaap):   Let me add I don't think it is any reason to block all the remaining (unintelligible) remaining (unintelligible) because in the rules because by the nature of policy as decisions have been taken to add a county code TLD of two letters in the root I mean about policy already says that it should only be on the official allocated list.

So in principle they're already blocked. There is nothing you need to do.

Now this a lot of thing why I have been pointing out in my (unintelligible) document I mean current proposal made up of somebody which says for all the allocated lists for the allocated codes for users and codes so these are the codes that ISO has already reserved (unintelligible). Excuse me.

So the recent list of codes and which ISO has set aside especially allocated, not reserved but allocated to be used to whatever the people wishes and not being for interchange.

And the recent RFC Internet, this draft which actually has a subset of this set aside to be used for private use being just published in their use and whether or not it will make it to ITF I don't have an idea at all.

But I just mentioned it because that's what actively going on. And but really reserve all the things of that are there on the moment implicitly it's already reserved by having the current policies of IANA/ICANN board.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Thank you. Thank you (Jaap). How do you recommend to proceed? Should we go with the boxes here like Heather started doing the status quo and try to discuss what exactly the status quo means?

(Jaap): Yes.

Heather Forrest: Carlos this is Heather. I think that would be helpful.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Yes thank you Heather. (Jaap) is this a new hand?

(Jaap): New hand. I am wondering what people mean with the ISO 3166 Dash two calls? I mean is it really part two which is a combination of part 1 plus regions inside country?

Heather Forrest: Sorry (Jaap), it's Heather. I'll answer that because I have used it. That's the often used shorthand for two letter codes we're dealing with...

(Jaap): Oh, okay.

Heather Forrest: ...in this section specifically with the two letter codes. And the convention's often Dash 3 for the three letter codes.

(Jaap):   Okay. Yes because I'm confused about I mean in ISO circles its actually Dash two means part two Dash 3 means part three. So that's why I wanted to be more precise.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Now I think it's very hard to separate the two and three letter codes but let's start with the options of the two letter codes.

And what the box says is to exclude the two letter gTLD strings in ASCII and other for the ccTLDs. We have the problem here what do we do with new countries?

And as I tried to develop just before we are dependent on a list that is not under our control. And by control I mean it in a soft way.

It's not an open bottom-up multi-stakeholder list. They just deal with one country and then they block these two letters. Heather?

Heather Forrest: Thank you Carlos. This is Heather. Just picking up on the point you've just made. I think historically ICANN has preferred this position from a legal point of view in the sense that ICANN does not want to be in the business of deciding, you know, who or what is a country. And there are some very serious political implications here.

We can think of a number of examples. I won't articulate them here because they may inflame some sensibilities and not others.

It but I think ICANN from a legal point of view has always been inclined and in whatever it does that this is not a decision taken by ICANN that it's some external body that we rely upon. And the convenience of the ISO list is that it

was an existing list let's say that something didn't have to be created from scratch.

So in terms of the benefits I think maintaining the status quo we need to add to that list of benefits that we have there and say yes of course it avoids conflicts with future countries.

We simply refer to the list and that also avoids the liability of having to decide who falls into the scope of this and who does not. Thank you.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Excellent. That means that we have set a certain amount of combinations of two letters probably also for three letters that we have to set them aside in a way or another.

And it's pretty easy to check if you come with your combination and other than the legacy combinations like .com or so on if you come with your combination and it's blocked then it's blocked and you cannot do anything about that.

The problem I see is that in the past it has been rather flexible. I mean if I take the two letter code of Columbia well so I don't go into northern countries because they also have problems with NU. This has been misused but that's one thing we're not going to deal with. We leave it. That's legacy. Heather?

Heather Forrest: Thank you Carlos. Just to clarify and be sure my comment was understood as well.

I'm not trying to predetermine us to this particular option. I'm simply saying that this is a benefit of this particular option that maintaining the status quo has that legal comfort to it, that removal of liability or avoidance of liability.

I'm not suggesting we don't discuss the other option. It's just that that is a benefit. And obviously well now that it's a clear burden is that we don't have two letter strings.

I'm sure there are plenty of folks out there who would have liked to have applied for - have applied for two letter new gTLDs.

So it is a restriction. It is a - it is something that prevents consumer choice to that extent. But there are significant benefits. And those need to be noted in our table.

And likewise when we look at these other options we need to state those as well. Thank you. Just not pre-determining our discussion saying we discussed this one and we're all agreed.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: So okay we have the legal security for everything that was used before. That I agree it's very important. So we would basically go back and say what they did in the gTLD was right at least for the two letter codes. Is that right?

Heather Forrest: Carlos this is Heather. I'll pop in. I think that's right. I would like to think that perhaps we can get some technical advice on this as well. And I'm not sure from whom, the ASO perhaps on each of these options.

I assume we would necessarily need technical advice on maintenance of the status quo because that has worked well up till now.

But to the extent that we were to consider which, you know, we will do consider options of something other than the status quo then I think we want to have some technical input on that and what that could possibly do. Thank you.

Yes. As far as I understand they have been requests for two letter combinations that are not possible right now and probably will face exactly the same on the three letter codes.

And Carlos this is Annebeth. And...

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Yes Annebeth please?

Annebeth Lange: ...hello?

Yes and you said that some two letter codes have been applied for that could be the way. I think the reason for that is they were too similar to some existing TLDs, ccTLDs. And that was for the idea and TLD is that they applied for and the letters...

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Yes, you're right.

...in non-ASCII too easy to it looked like the visual look of it was too close to another TLD in ASCII. So they had to be careful not to give some misunderstanding that way.

That's what...

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: It's more on the confusion...

Annebeth Lange: ...how I understand it. Yes, the confusion thing.

So I know that for I think it was Russia that the Russia applied for the two letter in Cyrillic that was an RU. But they were in Cyrillic letters. They looked like a Paraguay in ASCII so they couldn't have it.

So they had to do another combination of the letters for the Russia in Cyrillic to get their RDN ccTLD. So I think...

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Well that's...

Annebeth Lange: ...it's a really valid point here.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Yes. And we have mechanisms already in place for dealing with confusions at (unintelligible) so, that would be in my view I have two preliminary conclusions of the discussion so far.

There is a borderline between number of letters and names okay? I don't wish to say two or three or four because we have just all those four letter codes.

So at some point we're not talking about codes anymore there - we should jump into names. And one of the risks that we have and we have to expand this page of the risk of the actual system, not the list of actual system is that there is a lot of risk of confusion with international organizations that like to use codes as well. And they're not listed in the ISO. That is one of the main problems of the ISO and then the second one that Annebeth just mentioned the non-ASCII alphabet. So we face a...

Annebeth Lange: Yes.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: ...big problem there. But we will have to deal with that because there are big discussion about this international organizations. On the one hand if they are treaty-based or not and will they produce a list? Should we go and take this list and put it into the ISO three code list or the four code list and then the globalization into different alphabets. So those are two very valuable comments. Thank you very much Annebeth but I will put them into the box somehow.

You want to respond to that?

Annebeth Lange: Could comment Carlos? It's Annebeth again.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Yes please.

Annebeth Lange: And yes. It's just like the main problem for us is that it's only a code.

I know that the three letter codes essentially the three letter codes it's used by a lot of different organizations in postal and customs and cars and whatever.

But it can be used in many ways. But for a domain it's only one that can have it. And then that's the difference between trademarks as well.

A lot of different companies can have the same trademark but it's only one domain name. So...

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Sure.

Annebeth Lange: ...yes so we have to take that into consideration as well.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: I think this is very important and it should be at the introduction of the section of the two and three letter codes. (Jaap) please?

(Jaap):   Yes I want to again, I want to urge everybody really precise what I mean because I mean from the moment you started to talk about the history of .RU I mean you are also similarly showing confusingly similar things which exactly really part of the IDN.

And yes indeed the story is that RU Cyrillic looks very much like PY which is what is it. And so it's used for RF is really and isn't that it don't escapes. I mean it's more clean as its version the Cyrillic.

Anyway but should - what are the two don't mix things? We know that ISO 3166 is only about coding, not about names. And so it looks some - things might look for other people like a name but it is still a code.

And this - and so we should really precise the four letter codes I meant is actually ISO 3166 part three and that's the list of the historic previously used codes.

And it's - and they end up four letters because if you combine two countries in both you get four countries.

If you have something disappears completely there is special prefixes. It's not used for the (unintelligible). There are a lot of rules out of four letter codes exist and I don't really want to go into all the details here.

But really in the - if for instance the code P-E-R-U will show up in 3166 it is really a code and not the name of Peru. So it really deals with codes and not with names.

I mean it lists names but as I said these names are taken from the UN terminology base as much as possible. And so originally in the whole ICANN TLD namespace the codes were used as the codes for the TLDs.

And was it's actually expanded is that the definition of what's country are not is used for things like the fast track which basically says, you know, you can have an IDN name and but the people who also or the groups would come to the territory which have a listing in Section 9 of ISO 6130. Thirty-one sixty-six are illegible for having such a IDN.

So the defense random groups or regions with have their own names to suddenly pop up as a TLD.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Very, very, very good. Very good (Jaap). So we have these codes and we have these conflict with the names because at some point codes could become names. And we have the problem of similarity in our issues.

And we have the practice. We have the practical implications that so far the use of the ISO list has not been 100% pure with all respect to the precision of the ccNSO. So there are high expectations on what we come with.

I don't know if that puts into question the methodology that we're using of this list. I'm afraid that we can just generate options without having developed all type of conflicts that we have mentioned today.

Should we go back to the definitions, put a few more definitions of the ISO list and what is an ISO list, what is a code?

Should we brainstorm a little bit all possible conflicts or confusions that they have been so far or that they may come up in the future if we change track if we go away from the ISO list?

You have convinced me that the ISO list is written on stone even though it changes but we have to work from there and ask the people to take a closer look to the paper again.

Because I think we have made some progress. The pepper looks much better and we can have a more prospective, better perspective of the problem the next version of the paper.

I get a feeling that this table is not the right track to continue. Heather please?

Heather Forrest: Thank you Carlos. This is Heather. I think I would caution against us going down the list of overly complicating a definition of the ISO list.

I mean the way this is often done in a legal document is to say the list, you know, whether we call it a list whatever, the set of codes as determined from time to time by the international standardization organization.

And we somehow grandfather in any codes that have been made these sort of extraneous decisions that have been taken.

I think I wouldn't like to see us, yes go down the road of an overly complicated definition. I think we whatever the definition is has to identify that ISO's a living document.

As long as we identify ISO and we identify the purpose of what it is that they do then it's that whatever the document is and whatever it's called at that time. Thank you.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: I understand your worry and I don't want to go this track. But from the beginning since I joined this group I don't know who made it clear. I think it was (Bart), (Jaap) said listen all these codes were developed for statistical purposes you know? And here we are.

I mean they were developed to keep track of numbers. So they used letter to keep track of numbers and make a lot of sense so you don't confuse it.

But now we are using codes that were developed for statistical purposes for addressing things, addressing domain names. And so...

Annebeth Lange: Carlos this is...

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: ...we have to break...

Annebeth Lange: ...Annebeth.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: ...this not one way or another. I am ready to fully respect the list of country codes and defend it and so on. But there is a problem at conception here. Yes please Annebeth?

Annebeth Lange: I really don't agree with you there on the statistical, the reason behind the ISO code. Because that really mean that when it was divided into the three data codes for the global top level domains and (Yon Tufel) used the existing ISO list.

It's true that international standard organization they have their reason behind making this list. But when (Yon Tufel) he looked for a list somewhere that he could give the different countries their corner on the Internet where the local Internet community should take care of their part of the Internet. And he used the ISO code list.

And I think it's a huge difference between this list made up by ISO and the UN and lists - and established by us trying to make lists like the GAC will do to make lists of all geographical names in the world. That's something else. It's really a huge difference.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Well that's - thank you Annebeth but I agree with everything you said that this is still the question that I see on the table.

We took a list. It was developed for classifying countries. It was used for unique identifiers. And we're going to defend this list because it has a track record and some problems that we cannot lose going by - that we cannot solve if we go backwards.

And then methodological question is, is there a general framework for solving these problems in the future and should this general framework include lists?

Of course it will always include the ISO list. The question is should we work on lists or should we work on a general framework that takes another approach?

I don't want to block more of the conversation right now. And we're going towards the end of the hour so if you want to put some summary comments on the page please go ahead Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thank you Carlos. This is Heather. I hear your comments. And I don't think we can move away from the idea of a list when we ask the specific question what should we do about the codes on the ISO list?

And we can move away from the list if we decide to do something with other codes. That's where we can get into a framework.

We don't just say oh we want to deal with the ISO list and let's adopt some other list. Then we say we want to deal with the ISO list and some other codes and here's the framework as to how we're going to do it.

On the specific question of what do we do with the ISO list we've got to deal with the list bottom line.

So if that's the question we want to ask -- and I do throw that out if that is the question we want to ask what do we do about the ISO list then we have to deal with the list.

I don't interpret the discussion today as pre-determining the fact that everything has to be driven by a list. We have to deal with the ISO list because it is the status quo.

Whether we like it or not for whatever reason it was identified we have to deal with the ISO list. We can deal with other frameworks as we go and add them on but we have no choice on this one.

This is the status quo. This is what we've done. We have to decide what to do about the status quo.

So I agree with you Carlos, you know, that's - the intention is that we not just bind ourselves to the status quo if without good reason and we don't just bind ourselves to some list.

But on this particular question we have to deal with the list. We can't get around it. So...

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Sure. I fully agree. And I beg to get away from the status quo wording. And we need to...

Heather Forrest: Yes.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: ...include in the definitions what (Jaap) has proposed. We need the definition of ISO, ISO list and what Lars has proposed also.

We need the definition of what is exactly a code so we have a very thorough definition list of country names. We include also the territories that Annebeth mentioned.

So we are not ready for discussing the options. We have to go to the definition list and work a little bit more territories, ISO definitions and code definition as proposed in this meeting and hope that we can proceed from there.

That's my short summary of what I have learned. If somebody wants to add something if not we will put it down in the next version.

Lars Hoffman: Thomas this is Lars to try briefly to confirm that the next meeting will be two weeks today?

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: It's fine with me. I don't know about the times because it's a little bit late. Now times have shifted. I have to shift one hour. Annebeth I know it's late for you. Heather I know it's very early for you.

I've have my two, three meetings in my time zone. If somebody wants to propose a time shift I would be glad to hear it.

((Crosstalk))

Lars Hoffman: Yes Lars. I'll make it for suggestion on the list and then we'll take it from there. But the meeting will be on 13th of April and for the exact UTC time (unintelligible) get on the list.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Yes thank you Lars. Cheryl you have a comment on that please?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Yes I do, two comments. I will make my regular and continuous plea to just do things in a UTC time and be buggered to the changes of various daylight saving in other places around the world because it's round last time I checked and while part of the world is shifting one way others of us are shifting the other. So if we were all to agree to UTC and just stick to it, it would be much easier certainly in my calendar.

But also just ask Lars as you're looking for options for a UTC time be very aware of not just the well calendarized additional meetings that are running at the moment dealing with the IANA and accountability but also that a number of us have additional leadership meetings as well which adds another two or three meetings a week.

So being overweight in the calendar if we could avoid that would be good.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Thank you. Thank you very much (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: ...your comments. And Lars should send out the questionnaire on this with the times please.

Okay some people are dropping off the call for the moment. Thank you everybody and the co-chairs will work hard on the draft for the next meeting on time this time to give you enough time. Thank you everybody.

Woman: Thank you Carlos and good-bye everyone.

Woman: Thank you bye.

Annebeth Lange: Thanks everyone. Have a good day.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Thanks for your time Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Yes sure, sure.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Woman: Enjoy your cabin Annebeth. Have fun.

Terri Agnew: And (JoJo) you can please stop the recording.

Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Thank you Terri for your support. Thank you Lars.

Terri Agnew: You are welcome. Enjoy the rest of your day.

Carlos Raul Guitierrez: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Terri Agnew: You're welcome.

                            END