ICANN
Transcription
Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Country/Territory Names as tLDs
Tuesday, 06 June 2017 at 05:00 UTC

Note: 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: https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ctn-06jun17-en.mp3 Adobe Connect recording: https://participate.icann.org/p4yarcxm026/
Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/4xDfAw
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar Page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

ccNSO:
Mary Uduma, .ng
Mirjana Tasic, .rs
Nick Wenban-Smith, .cymru

ALAC:
Cheryl Langdon-Orr, ALAC CCWG Liaison

GNSO:
Heather Forrest, IPC (co-Chair)
Susan Payne, IPC
Alexander Schubert, RySG

Additional Members:
Jaap Akkerhuis, attending as ISO 3166 Expert

On Audio Only: none

Apologies:
Annebeth Lange
Rosalia Morales

ICANN Staff:
Emily Barabas
Joke Braeken
Steve Chan
Bart Boswinkel
Julie Bisland

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Julie Bisland: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. And welcome to the CWG on Country and Territory Names as TLDs meeting on the 6th of June, 2017. On the call today we have Susan Payne, Jaap Akkerhuis, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Heather Forrest, Mirjana Tasic, Nick Wenban-Smith. We have apologies from Annebeth Lange and Rosalia Morales. From staff we have Emily Barabas, Joke Braeken, Steve Chan, Bart Boswinkel and myself, Julie Bisland.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I will turn this meeting back over to Bart Boswinkel. Please begin.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Julie. Heather, do you want to open the meeting or shall I continue?

Heather Forrest: Bart, I'm more than happy for you to open the meeting if you'd like. Hopefully you can hear, hopefully this is working.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Heather Forrest: As I understand it really, you know, this is opportunity for us to regroup on any final comments that were received. I will say this, to the extent that there's, you know, any avoidance of doubt, let's say, I went through the report myself, and I should have confirmed by email, but I don't have any further additions or subtractions to make. I was – I'm incredibly impressed with the amount of work that staff has put into this. You know, yourself very much included, yourself and Emily. And very much also appreciate the contributions of Jaap. So I did not send around a draft because I did not have anything

major to add at this point, but I'll turn it to you, Bart, for the broader perspective on that. Thanks.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Thank you, Heather. So let's turn to the second reading of the draft final paper, say, as you may have noted, I've sent around the, say, and asked you to submit any comments, if any, right after the call next – two weeks ago already. The only comment I received was from Jaap in addition to that's around the, say, a section on Page 9 with respect to the ISO or description of the ISO body – ISO bodies involved in ISO 3166 so with the addition of the technical working group. So that's on Page 9 in the version which I sent around on Monday.

I just will – I will just run through the, say, the changes made to the interim report. One is on Page 4 in the Executive Summary reflecting, say, the public comments received and they were not conclusive regarding the recommendations.

Secondly is the – again a section on the public comments on Page 33 describing what has been done with the public comments and how the working group deal with it. So in general that is, again, say they reflect the support or non support of any of the recommendations in particular the support of Recommendations 1, 2 and 4 and again, the divergence with respect to the Recommendation 3 and Recommendation 3 is about how to organize successive work if any to this working group.

And then finally a new annex has been added starting at Page 83 on, say, which includes a summary of say the comments received, and that is similar to the public comment summary submitted by staff. It is suggested because we as staff feel that in this way whoever is going to take over and however next round of discussions is organized, they should be – people should be aware of the full breadth of comments in particular with respect to the two and three letter codes because, again, it's not just a divergence of the working

group itself but also the divergence of the public comments, which is interesting.

So that is what with respect to the – all the comments made. If there are no further additional comments from anyone on the call, let's pause here for a moment and rephrase it. Are there any questions, additions from people on the call? Because we did not receive, as Heather said, any comments from other members of the working group. I see Susan's hand is up. Go ahead, Susan and Heather.

Susan Payne: Yes, hi. Can you hear me?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I can hear you, Susan.

Susan Payne: Oh good. Good, thank you. Just checking. Yes, great apologies for not sending them sooner but I did send some comments late yesterday afternoon. There are only two very minor ones. So it – would it be helpful – it doesn't sound as though you received them…

Bart Boswinkel: No, I haven't…

((Crosstalk))

Susan Payne: …but would it be helpful if I…

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, go ahead.

Susan Payne: Should I just mention – I'll just go through them quickly if that's okay?

Bart Boswinkel: That's okay. Maybe one question, are they very substantive or they're just editorial?

Susan Payne: One is definitely editorial just because it's in the Executive Summary and it's where you've added the text about the public comments on the interim report and reference the alternatives A, B and C or, you know, where you say several responses favored A. And it just seemed to me that that was in slightly the wrong place because it kind of – that text that comes out of nowhere. And so I was suggesting to move it to the – to after the following paragraph.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

Susan Payne: I mean, you know, it's not essential. But I felt that there's a reference to those alternatives without them having been yet introduced in the document.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes – okay go ahead, sorry.

Susan Payne: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: …just went through your – I just see your comments.

Susan Payne: Yes, it's definitely editorial.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Susan Payne: And then the other one was in Section 5.1.5. I'm sorry, I'm just trying to find that.

Bart Boswinkel: And do you have a page number?

Susan Payne: Yes. On my document it's Page 20 but I have a printout that's got the redlines in. So I think that would be right, Page 20.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Sup: And it's the first paragraph where it reads – towards the end of the first paragraph it says, "The outcomes of this debate can be summarized as follows." And I would – my suggestion was that rather than we say "outcomes" we change that sentence to say, "The competing views advanced by working group members during this debate can be summarized as follows," because it doesn't seem to me that – they don't appear to be outcomes, if you like. And they're rather, you know, they're a succession of different perspectives presented by members within the working group.

Whereas the use of the term "outcomes" makes it seem more like they're conclusions that we've reached.

Bart Boswinkel: Heather, any – or anybody else, how do you want to, so this goes back to – so for the discussion say, 5.1.5 is about the two letter codes. So that was part of the interim report. We – as – in the redline it has not been changed. It has been there as of say before we submitted the interim report and before we started discussing the three letter codes. So from that perspective it's very old language and it was the sense of the group at the time around the two letter codes. So just to provide some background.

And my understanding is, Susan, you want to change that language with respect to the two letter codes?

Susan Payne: That was my suggestion. I mean, if it's too late to do so, you know, I don't feel – it's not essential but I felt that amendment made it – is more clearly reflective of what those subsequent discussion points are if you like, but I don't think they are outcomes. I think they're the range of views expressed.

Bart Boswinkel: Anybody else want to respond? Heather, I see your hand up.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Bart. Look, I had a concern that was similar to Susan's and I didn't articulate it in written comments because I frankly wasn't sure how to articulate it. And I think it dovetails Susan's comment. I mean, on the one hand I agree that her language – I see both points, you know, your point, Bart, is that that was the feeling of the group as of that point. The document is a living document, however. And things have moved on since that point.

My concern was more broad which is to say I think there are certainly concerns within the GNSO community that conclusions were reached on the basis, you know, conclusions reached in relation to two letter codes were reached on the understanding that we'd be progressing further and applying that sort of rationale to three letter codes and so on and so forth. And we've dropped off from that path, let's say.

And I didn't want to reopen the apple cart in my comments to say, you know, in light of where we are now I personally feel like, you know, there are reasons to revisit the conclusions on two letter codes. And I think that in some way let's say picks up Susan's concern, although perhaps not precisely, this was reflective, you know, it clarified that this was thinking at that point. Susan might want to chime in here just to be very, very sure that I haven't pushed her comments in a different direction or put a spin on them that she didn't want put on them.

But I think the fact that this is a living document and it doesn't clearly reflect the language that we're looking at here that you know, there's a time component to it, as of this date the thinking was X, and as at this date the thinking was Y. I mean, maybe that could happen. Maybe that's what we need to say is that as of the point of concluding on two letter codes this is where we were and then we moved on with our thinking and went further.

So perhaps Susan might like to interject just to make sure that I didn't muddy the waters considerably for her and make it more difficult for her. Thanks.

Bart Boswinkel: All right. Susan, you want to chime in?

Susan Payne: Thanks. Yes, I guess I don't disagree with what Heather said. I think that's a good point that it is a living document. Yes, I mean, my – this was – that particular edit was something that the – was picked up in the IPC comments and so when I was looking through some of the comments that had been submitted it seemed to me it was a good point, you know, it was a reasonable point to make that those listed discussions were exactly that, they were a kind of summary of the nature of the discussion rather than – as I say, rather than conclusions, if you like, because not all of those points as summarized are agreed with by everyone. You know, there are definitely different points of view.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, okay. Anybody else on the call, any comments on the – say, on this particular point about 5.1.5 – 5.1.5? I see – if I look at the chat I see Nick Wenban-Smith is – agrees with the minor amendments from Susan. Cheryl is typing. Cheryl agrees as well. Susan, I thank you for submitting. My suggestion is that based on where we're at and it reflects the sense of the working group that we include them and that we – I'll send them out for one final call for – by the working group itself and then take them as such.

Just a minute, please, somebody at the door. Sorry, I'm back. Family moving. So going back so what my suggestion is – maybe just in response sending around Susan's amendments, not the full – or the full document again, but this redline and ask if there are any comments from others from the working group. And then if not, say, by the end of this week, consider them adopted say as a kind of second reading what we're doing right now with respect to the document itself. Is that workable? Okay. Thank you.

Now, moving forward, I think any other comments? Heather, go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Bart. This is a process point more than a substance point, just to be, you know, just so everyone is clear as to what happens next. I think we need

to have you know, just a second to say that what happens is we have our final report. Can you, Bart or Emily, can you confirm the final report then go out for public comment is my understanding is what happens next. And specifically needs to be raised with our two chartering organizations and perhaps drum up public comment through that avenue. Is that where we're going here, just so folks know that this isn't, if you like, the last opportunity to make comments. Thanks.

Bart Boswinkel: Heather, this is Bart again. Say, that was the next item on the agenda, the next steps. In principle, say, there is no public comment anymore. So the next step would be that this report would be submitted to the chartering organizations and for their support. So this is a paper.

Once it's, say, approved or supported or even objected by the chartering organizations, it goes back to the working group for just to say assume both chartering organizations, the ccNSO and the GNSO, accept it, it goes back to the working group just effectively to the chairs, the cochairs, they add the comments and from there then it's submitted and made public for everybody else.

So that's the step. So there is no public comment in the sense of opening up another 40-day period again for people to react; it now goes to the ccNSO, GNSO and others who are interested to discuss the final paper of the working group. Any questions? I can show it – the next step I can show them in a slide if that's more helpful. But then I need to be – can you upgrade me to presenter or host please?

So according to the charter, and let me repeat it, the way it's done, say, and if you would go back to the charter, is this is, as you may have noted in the heading, this is the final paper, the previous version as the interim paper; this is the final paper. This will be submitted to the chartering organizations which are the ccNSO and GNSO. And they can express their support and/or no objection to the final paper. If they do object, then the working group needs to

revisit that objections and the rationale and either provide a supplemental paper, either take it on board or not.

Then include the results of the deliberation so the Council resolutions and/or whatever the way the councils or the GNSO and the ccNSO want to express their deliberations will be included in the paper. And that will comprise the final report. So the final report is the final paper or the supplemental final paper plus the results of the deliberations of the chartering organizations. And only after the final report has been made public, the working group is closed and dissolved and the final report is submitted in this case to the – again to the ccNSO and GNSO.

And or if the chartering organizations, the ccNSO and GNSO, come to the conclusion that it is done, they have the ability to jointly end the working group as well. So these are the next steps. So my suggestion is we conclude the – the final paper by the end of this week, say one more round of comments on suggestions from Susan, that we start the cochairs write a cover letter and submit the final paper to the chartering organizations by the end of this week, early next week, so that's well in time for the ICANN 59.

And we'll see if we can get it on the agenda of the ccNSO and GNSO Councils and communities and others who are interested for a final discussion and final feedback to the working group. And so that's it. Heather, go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Bart. Just to confirm that I'll make sure that this makes it onto the GNSO Council's agenda for Johannesburg. Thanks.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I'll suggest it to Katrina and/or Annebeth to put it on the ccNSO Council agenda. So that's the plan. So these were the next steps in plural. Any other questions regarding the next steps? None? Then any other business? Any questions, comments at this stage? I see Heather's hand is up. Heather, go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Bart. I do have a question. So we have a meeting in the diary for two week's time. What do we want to do with that one? It seems to me we probably at this stage don't need it.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, that was my idea as well. So hopefully by then we – say, there are no further additional comments on the – say, on Susan's comments so we can close it so that will be the second reading of Susan's comments, and then we have a final paper so there is no need.

Heather Forrest: And, Bart, just to confirm with Susan's edit, what we're going to do is we're going to just extract that one little paragraph and send that around by email rather than sending the whole document because I'm afraid if we send the whole document we're liable to get stone cold silence. Thanks.

Bart Boswinkel: That's one, or people start, yes, wake up and start editing again. So and that time has been gone so we now already in the third week. So completely agree. Anybody else? Any other questions? If not, then thank you very much and I give you back a half hour of your day. Bye-bye.

Man: Okay. Bye-bye for now.

Julie Bisland: Thank you, all. Today's meeting is adjourned. Verizon operator, (Klein), would you please stop the recordings and disconnect all lines? And to everyone, have a fantastic day.

END