Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Country/Territory Names as TLDs
TRANSCRIPT
Tuesday 10 June 2014 at 0700 UTC
Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ccwg-unct-20140610-en.mp3
On page: http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#june

Attendees:

ccNSO
Henry Chan, .hk
Ron Sherwood, .vi
Han Liyun, .cn
Paul Szyndler, .au (Co-Chair)
Mirjana Tasic, .rs
Laura Hutchison, .uk

GNSO
Chris Chaplow, BC
Heather Forrest, IPC (Co-Chair)
Maxim Alzoba, NTAG

Apologies:
Daniel Kalchev, .bg
Annebeth Lange, .no
Lise Fuhr, .dk
Erick Iriarte Ahon, .pe
Olga Cavalli (GAC)

ICANN staff:
Marika Konings
Bart Boswinkel
Kristina Nordstrom
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Andre). Good morning, good afternoon, good

evening everybody, this is the Cross Community Working Group on the Use

of Country/Territory Names as TLDs meeting on the 10th of June, 2014.

On the call today we have Paul Szyndler, Ron Sherwood, Han Liyun, Henry Chan and Mirjana Tasic. We have apologies from Daniel Kalchev, Annebeth Lange, Lise Fuhr and Olga Cavalli sends her tentative apology.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Bart Boswinkel, Kristina Nordstrom and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, Paul.

Paul Szyndler: Thank you very much. I apologize, as I mentioned to Bart previously, I'm remotely located at the moment so I would appreciate if he could steer us through the first few administrative parts of the agenda, etcetera, because I don't have that in front of me but certainly happy, Bart, to work through some of the back history of the study group, etcetera if it's actually going to be beneficial for the purposes of this call, given the relatively few attendees.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, thank you Paul. And maybe just for you, say, the agenda is a welcome introduction so maybe you provide an introduction by the co-chairs so it's maybe provide a bit of the background on why you got involved and your role, then review of charter and study group so I'll do that. I had a presentation going into some of the details of the charter so everybody is aware of how this working group is foreseen to interact with the SOs and ACs - the participating SOs and ACs and its internal mechanisms, etcetera.

And then a little bit maybe on the background and the results of the study group itself. Again, I think we need to stress that people who participate should read the report - the final report of the study group because that is the starting point of the work of this working group.

And then a little bit discussion on the face to face meeting in London and what we intend to achieve from there a little bit maybe the agenda and then closure.

So if you just give a bit of background, say, on your role and your interim role etcetera and why you got involved so people understand. Most of them on the call are from the ccNSO so they are aware but especially for the others.

Paul Szyndler: Well thank you very much, Bart. This is Paul Szyndler again. Yes, I was the chair of the previous country and territory names study group, as it was so named, that was established by the ccNSO Council back in I believe December 2010.

That study group was somewhat of an experiment in what has now led to cross constituency engagement and in as much it drew members from across ICANN.

It was - the group was established in the acknowledgement that there's need for study required into how country and territory names are used within the ICANN environment.

Acknowledgement that they're used in different ways or could possibly even be used in different ways in terms of IDN ccTLDs, new gTLDs, the existing ccTLD framework. That was basically the genesis of this work. And acknowledgement by the ccNSO Council that perhaps some work should be done in assessing whether this - the way country and territory names are treated is consistent, if there's a desirability for consistency and if so where we should go from there.

Acknowledging that it was originally a group established by the ccNSO Council, that is the group that we - that is the Council we reported back to. And it didn't have any pre-supposition of resolutions or subsequent actions. It was, as the name suggests, a study group to look into an issue that had appeared and not necessarily make any conclusive findings but be as constructive as possible in terms of outlining next steps.

My personal interest as well, use of country and territory names is not particularly contentious from an Australian perspective, however, we do have five or six extraterritorial ccTLDs, that's not unique to us; the Dutch and the - and the French have that circumstance as well. However, it was just an interesting subject to look into.

As I said, that group was convened or formed by Council in December 2010. And we really commenced our work of about a year or so later in early 2011 with the aim originally of providing a final report towards the end of 2010, however, it ended up being a little bit later than that and being mid 2013.

But I don't want to go too much further into that at this point because (unintelligible) the outcomes of the group and that which I was to discuss later.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Thank you, Paul. Any questions to this so far for Paul? I don't see any hands up in the Adobe room or anybody online. Okay thank you. Nathalie, could you put up the slides please, I sent you? Thank you.

And again I'm sorry, this may overlap with some Paul already said but I'll still run through it. Oh (unintelligible). Yes, oh you made me presenter, great. Okay this is just a bit about the charter itself so what's in the charter and starting point, etcetera, and where we hope we'll be heading.

So the purpose again, this builds on the recommendations of the study group Paul has just mentioned. And now you can read it for yourself but for Paul it's - the purpose is, say, review the current status of representations of country and territory names under the current ICANN policies, guidelines, and procedures.

Now this is quite a mouthful for something that already happened by the study group and it's, say, it's more directing the working group into further expand so how are the different forms of country and territory names treated.

The study group came up with a kind of typology for country and territory names ranging from the representation, say the full representation of the country and territory names so the real official names until some, yes, say how country and territory names are represented in local languages, not even in official or designated languages from a territory.

And there is quite a range of different types including, for example, historical names. And it depends very much and say if you look at the current rules in the - under the - for the ccTLDs and for the gTLDs first of all they're treated differently, and secondly, some of these names - or some of the categories on the typology are included and some are excluded.

And say that was one of the major findings I would say from the study group. So it's first developing the typology and then see how they apply in the different - under the different set of rules and identifying some issues. So one of the tasks of the working group will be to further explore and analyze this part of the results of the study group.

And then secondly, and that's in the charter as well, it's a combination of - a combination of two goals, in fact. First of all check whether it's feasible to develop a harmonized framework on the use of country names. As I just said the study group developed a typology with different categories of domain names.

And I think one of the major tasks of the working group will be is to check which are the most appropriate ones and which aren't as a kind of framework and then understand what the implications are and if, say, if the working group is able to develop such a universal or a framework then try to develop some details how they could be applied and what the impact will be under the different set of rules.

And then based on that, say, that would be the complete framework, present this to the different SOs and ACs and from there submit it to the participating SOs and AC. I see Heather is on there as well.

So that's more or less the purpose of this working group based on the recommendations of the study group and which has been embedded in - or which is not part of the charter and the purpose of this working group overall.

Now what is important probably because geographic designations are used in say for different purposes in ICANN environment. And because we're mainly dealing with, say, we're dealing with ccTLDs and gTLDs what is very important to understand is that this working group will only be focusing according to its charter and that's the scope of representations of names of countries and territories listed on or eligible to be listed on the alpha 2 code international standard.

The reason is in order to make very clear there is say a common subset of names which are dealt with in - under the new gTLD policy and the policies relating to the selection of ccTLD strings and that's those - and that's the common - the mean, I would say, that is just the countries and territories names listed or the countries and territories listed in ISO 3166.

So if a territory is not listed on ISO 3166 then it's excluded, it means the framework will be developed is not applicable and the main reason is, say, these geographic designations are in principle not eligible as a ccTLD and therefore only new gTLD rules apply if, yes, if - or they're only eligible for new gTLDs if the rules permit so. So that's a very important scope so I'll reaffirm this in the next slide.

And, secondly, what's very important to understand for the scope, we only talk about country and territory names as top level domains. What is happening at second level domains that is say for gTLDs is a matter of policies and discussions in the ICANN environment.

And for ccTLDs it's something in say which is dealt with locally. So again, that is excluded of the scope of this working group. So, again, there it is. So out of scope, other geographical indicators such as reasons and the use of country and territory names in second or lower level - other level.

Now, the deliverables, and this is in preparation, I would say, already from - for the face to face meeting in London. Looking at the charter what needs to be delivered is, first of all, a work plan and a tentative schedule. It is very clear that say at the early stages of the lifecycle of a working group a work plan can only be tentative and the schedule as well.

But it's included in order to make the working group members realize that they need to focus on concrete deliverables and work against a certain timeline and planning in order to make some progress.

The second deliverable - and that's maybe too early at this stage but will be in the future is especially progress papers to inform the community on progress made by this working group and the chairs or the co-chairs of the working group will inform say on a regular basis the - should inform on a regular basis the participating SOs and ACs.

And there is a mechanism in the charter on say building a final report going from an interim report, say, where it could be interpreted as describing issues and some tentative direction of solutions if any for public comments a final paper which could be a draft final paper. And this final paper will be submitted to the participating SOs and ACs.

And once the participating SOs and ACs support or endorse the recommendations and the output of the working group it will be included in the final report and that will be resubmitted but then just to ensure that all participating SOs and ACs and the working group are clear that, say, the recommendations are supported and that is documented.

Say if one of - now moving forward, if one of the participating SOs and ACs, let me - I'm not talking about closure - if one of the participating SOs and ACs does not agree with the recommendations of the working group the working group has the opportunity to update or amend its recommendations taking into account the - maybe the concerns of that participating SO or AC.

This is not mandatory, it is - it's a decision of the working group, say, I could imagine, let's say, if there is very strong opposition and there's no room to bridge the gap then the working group will submit its final paper including, say, the disagreement or non-support of one of the SOs and ACs as submitted to the SOs and ACs.

On the other hand it could also, as I said, update its supplemental or its recommendations and submit it in a supplemental paper so that's the amended - it includes the amended recommendations and submit it again to all SOs and ACs to seek their endorsements.

So once the final report - so that is final paper non-endorsement or endorsement of SOs and ACs is submitted the working group will formally close.

Now let me take a step back, say, before - because that was the closure of the working group, if you look at the operations of the working group, again, as a I said, reporting on progress is considered to be very important so both the participating SOs and ACs and to the community and the community in the format of progress reports.

What is important as well, say, is the internal decision making of the working group. Again, there is a very simple and non-consensus, well, which more or less reflects that a bit of the experiences of the ccNSO or cross community working groups initiated by the ccNSO it is a consensus rule where the co-chairs determine whether there is consensus or non-consensus.

And the underlying criteria is that the - so if there is really strong objection then it's clear there is no consensus or one or two so it's a bit of a qualitative consensus role.

And there is always the opportunity if - to move forward of that - or they should be recorded, the minority position so the minority position could be of one person but also it could be of more and which has proven to be very workable is that for every document before there will be a, say, consensus call or sense of whether there is consensus that at least two readings of a document needs to proceed such a call.

So you can see - and that worked pretty well in some of the more contentious working groups which I was - which I participated as staff and supported as such. So at least two readings of documents and then the usual rules about adjustment and update of charter and as I said, final report by the working group for - to be submitted to the SOs and AC.

Now moving on I'll just discuss closure and then post closure again. As soon, as I said, as soon as the final report is submitted to the SOs and ACs that's the closure of the working group. As of that moment the participating SOs and ACs, if there are recommendations to follow up they should follow up it's the role of the participating SOs and ACs to follow up.

So that's out of scope of the working group itself so that could be share the information with the community, inform the Board, launch a new working group if necessary launch a PDP or I could imagine the case, for example, where based on the recommendations of this - of the working group the ccNSO could revisit the IDN PDP or take it into account in the review of the IDN PDP policy as still - as proposed to the ICANN Board.

So that may be - so that's these are just examples. But you can see and you get the drift of how the mechanisms of the charter work. And finally, and I

think that's very important as well that there is no role for the working group to monitor and review implementation if any. This is a role of the SOs and ACs and whether they - how they could, yes, they should organize the follow up of that monitoring and review of the recommendations and the implementations.

That was about it around the - yes, the core of this charter. Are there any questions? None? Okay thank you. I've noted that Heather is on the call as well. Oh, yes, I see a question from Chris. Chris, go ahead.

Chris Chaplow: Yes, good morning, Bart. Just - I was just wondering, we're talking about the post closure, are you...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Chris Chaplow: ...are you telling us that in the way that this is different from normal procedures because I'm not quite sure, or are you really...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: No, no, no, it's one - sorry, Chris. No, absolutely not. It's just to make clear it's - if you take - would take a 10,000 feet view of the working group and say from initiation to closure that's fine, that's all dealt with in the charter. But in after life of any working group there is an implementation phase as well if at all. And it's just to make very clear that out of scope of this working group and how it's going to be dealt with is in fact up to every SO and AC.

Chris Chaplow: Thank you, yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Any other questions?

Paul Szyndler: Bart, it's Paul here again. Not so much a question but a point of clarification. I...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Paul Szyndler: ...made a very short sweet summary with regard to the activities of the study group that led into this working group. I certainly welcome - and I did so noting that many of those people on this call have been involved in the study group process.

I'd also welcome questions on how we arrived at where we are at now and expand upon that summary of the study group's working - if anybody sees that of any value. But I believe currently pretty much everyone here has been involved previously but I don't wish to gloss over it. I just want to reiterate that invitation.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. So any questions on the study group itself and the results of the study group? No? I don't see any hands up or anything in the chat. Let's - so let me scroll back on - hoping you don't get sea sick - on the deliverables. I think that's a good starting point for the next part of the - of the discussion and of this call.

The working group will have its first face to face meeting in London. I can't recall the timing etcetera but I think it was on Thursday morning, isn't it, Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yes, that's correct, 8 o'clock...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, 8 o'clock so quite a challenge after the social event probably but still 8 o'clock it will be. And I think looking at, say, deliverables I think, say, in my view it would be very good and from a support staff view it would be very good if we could start the discussions around a kind of work plan and that would include, say, the first of all say the deliverables, say how we want to move forward regarding the first item so that's further review and the impact

of say country and territory names on the different rules and rule sets and attach a bit of a time line, etcetera, to it.

And secondly, and related, a bit about - around the frequency of meetings of this working group. So one of things I think Marika and I note is there is a bit of a different base in, say, between the ccNSO and the GNSO and people working in the GNSO and the ccNSO. And so that needs some further discussion.

I think another one that these would be my major, major items and - for the meeting on Wednesday or Thursday morning. I don't know - Heather or Paul, if you want to add another one or Marika?

Paul Szyndler: Bart, this is Paul, unless somebody else want to jump in, no, I think those are the major issues that need to be covered. It's a necessity that the first meeting be largely administrative in nature and I expect that those of us that have been assisting with the formation of this working group will have the skeleton of a work plan and a schedule available so we're not looking at a blank canvas but rather we'll have some ideas outlined; everybody will go through them, respective introductions and affiliations and then into expectations of this group.

There may be the need to, again, given the limited number of participants on this call, cover some of the material we already have done in terms of how this working group came to be. But there will be a few issues in terms of our working methods, chairpersonship, etcetera, to be reconfirmed. Doesn't mean it will be any less worthwhile a meeting but something that I think will be worth setting the scene.

One of the points I wanted to reiterate was something that Bart raised earlier about the study group that we went through the process there was not prescriptive, there was no predetermined outcome. We described as best we

could where we thought the study group was going to go and in the end it was relatively accurate.

So invite everyone to - in considering a draft work plan if the outcome seems a little bit amorphous and it seems a little bit uncertain I welcome people to either provide clarification where they can or accept that this is not a prescriptive process either. We don't quite know exactly where it is going to end up and I'll want everyone to keep that in mind. It doesn't make the process any less valuable but it's something that I just want to put on the table, as part of our discussions that we'll have in London on the work plan front and center.

So that's all I had to add, Bart (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Heather, you want to add - yes.

Heather Forrest: Yes, please. May I? I think I'd like to build on Paul's comment if I may and say I think it's important, Paul, that you and I articulate as well from our respective groups and going forward our positions that indeed the formation of a study group was not envisioned when the - when the - or excuse me, the formation of a working group was not envisioned when the - or in any way predetermined when the study group kicked off.

This was - the recommendation that there be a working group was indeed something that we came to after a fair bit of discussion over quite a length period of time so I hope that that would allay any fears that there's any sort of predetermined outcome as to what we're doing.

In regards to London I fully support what's been said. I think it's important that the process be dealt with, that the SOs and ACs involved feel as if they

understand what's going on and the expectations are clear from the beginning. So...

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Heather. Marika, you want to add anything?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No, I think I'm all good. Just to note, you know, Bart, you and me can maybe start working on, you know, indeed discuss the chair's - can then review so indeed we have something to look at in London.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Yes. Okay then are there any other questions, etcetera? I think we've got the go and set for the working group. We have a - kind of skeleton for an agenda in London. Everybody is aware where we're heading if all, any other questions? Any other points?

Paul Szyndler: Yet again at the risk of monopolizing the call, Bart, it's Paul here again. Just to reiterate to everyone I assume I'm telling staff something that that they were already going to do that obviously the circulation of the recording of this call, even the limited attendance, is quite important and I invite everyone's patience when we get back to London because as you can appreciate many people will be covering these materials for the first time and didn't do so on this call.

And that's pretty much all I had to add other than look forward to seeing everyone in London.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Okay thank you. Yes, I thank you for attending this call and looking forward to you in London. Nathalie, can you stop the recording?

Nathalie Peregrine: Yes of course. (Andre), you may now stop the recording. Thank you very much for your support.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

END