

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

Monday, 7 December 2015 at 21:00 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.

Attendees:

ccNSO:

Mirjana Tasic, .rs
Paul Szyndler, .au
Grigori Saghyan, .am
Ron Sherwood, .vi
Laura Hutchinson, .uk
Annebeth Lange, .no
Joke Braecken, .eu

GNSO

Carlos Raul Gutierrez, NPOC (co-Chair)
Susan Payne, NTAG
Maxim Alzoba, NTAG
Griffin Barnett, IPC
Robin Gross, NCSG

At-Large:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr

Other:

Jaap Akkerhuis

Apologies:

Heather Forrest, IPC (Co-Chair)
Colin O'Brien, IPC
Sanna Sahlman, .fi.,

ICANN staff:

Bart Boswinkel

Lars Hoffman
Kim Carlson

Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: The recording has started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Melanie). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the CWG on use of country and territory names at TLD's on the 7th of December 2015.

On the call today we have (Sara Longenal), (Maxim Ozober), Robin Gross, (Anna Beth Lan), (Yap Akaziz), (Carlos Gutierrez), (Paul Shen), (Yoki Bracken), (Laura Hutchison), (Jason Bonnet), (Niana Tazik), (Susan Payne) and (Ron Sherwood).

We received apologies from (Colin O'Brien) and (Heather Forrest). From staff we have Lars Hoffman, Bart Boswinkel, (Kim Carlton) and myself Natalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all too please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you Natalie this is Bart Boswinkel from the transcript. This is a bit of a weird call say in consult - after consulting with the co-chairs and based on the previous call we say that we thought it would be best that we from staff would provide you an update where we are with regard to this survey and propose a way forward with regard to summary et cetera.

In order to do so we wanted to first say seek your feedback and whether you agree on a introduction of a tool and that's a new item too on the agenda and that's starting to create a dedicated Wiki space for the CTN.

Some of you will be aware of say the Wiki space for example the CWG and the CCWG and looking at it say from a distance we thought after consulting with the co-chairs that say a more active use of the Wiki space at least to use

it as a repository for the different documents that have been floating around would be useful.

And we just started to introduce it for another say for another working group not specifically for this (reda) - into the CWG and CCWG. And we just want to inform you on a potential way on how to use it.

And for that reason I would like to if you agree want to hand it over to (Kim Carlton) and Lars to introduce you to a potential use of Wiki space for this working group. Lars, (Kim) over to you.

Lars Hoffman: Hi everybody this is Lars for the record. And (Kim) if you're online are you able to share your screen and talk people through it? Okay there you go I'll hand over to you and then if you hand it back to me I'll talk a little bit about submission so far.

(Kim Carlton): Hi everyone can you hear me okay?

Woman 1: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes we can.

(Kim Carlton): So Lars did you want to give an overview first and then have me...

Lars Hoffman: All right I'm going to take over very briefly (Kim) I think there might be some muting that needs to take place on your side.

Bart Boswinkel: Go ahead Lars.

Lars Hoffman: So I'm - there we go this sounds much better. While we get this sorted out the submission so far I sent around an overview for the group together with the agenda for this call.

I believe we have roughly I did a quick headcount, 31 submissions plus the center overview which contains 22 so that's quite an impressive number of feedback.

Most of them have come from individual country code providers. There were four from individual GAC members and one from the ALAC, two from GNSO stakeholder group constituencies and three individual ones.

And I note that although the deadline has passed that we have special requests from the GAC as a whole as well as from VeriSign to submit a little bit later due to personal circumstances especially the Verisign participants has undergone surgery I believe last week so they will submit this week or early next at the very latest.

The overview that I sent around I would like you to note that it's not a staff summary in any way. These are collated submissions that are taken word for word and have not been edited.

So this can be taken as a reference document. We will also make sure (Kim) will talk you through this in a moment to slowly post all the answers on the Web so you can see for yourself that it's just a copy and paste for reference purposes.

Obviously that will be helpful but this document here the overview that was sent around contains everything. And there has been a mentioning from (dot FI) that I've overlooked their submission and I apologize for that. This will be updated with them with the next version.

And I'll go back to what we planned from here on going out but I'll pass it on to (Kim) first to talk you through the Wiki page. And to those that have already looked at the Wiki and some of you might have looked at the Wiki on the GNSO space.

This is being created I believe on the ccNSO at least their side of things but (Kim) will have more information. Thank you. (Kim) over to you.

(Kim Carlton): Thanks Lars. As Bart and Lars mentioned we are going to use this Wiki space as repository for document submissions. It's a way to have version and document control.

I'm not sure how many of you already know that the CTN does have a working Wiki. I'm not sure if it's something people visit very often. Let me just show you what we're using on the ccNSO side.

And we're just going to use this as a guideline. We're going to use this and nothing is set in stone. So anybody have any suggestions feel free to let me or Bart or Lars know.

But we're going to start it out as a migration of what's already on there and then be able to add the documents as they come in. Just kind of highlight some of the things we track action items on here.

And then this particular working group on the ccNSO is very document heavy and we do need to keep track of documents and versions so we do have pages and sub-pages where we're able to track the documents and the versions and the dates they were created and then spaces for comments and statuses.

Other than that we're going to make it very similar to this unless anybody has any suggestions or objections. But that's it just wanted to show you briefly the current Wiki page that we're using for the GRC and the ccNSO.

Anybody have any comments or questions? Okay Lars I guess that's it unless you had any questions.

Lars Hoffman: No that's very good. Well I mean if there is no question it's a good result thanks (Kim) that's much appreciated. So just as a quick way forward on the document that (Scott) was going to prepare we touched on this briefly during our last call.

I will take it up with Bart create - if you want an overview of the submissions of the content of the submissions. So this would obviously include some form of (a invitation) by staff but you have the reference section in there.

And what we're trying to do is to give you a brief overview visually of some (colors) and some percentage numbers similar to the survey that was submitted by the center.

And so to see how many respondents have supported each of the various options that we will also work on a way to break this down to see which contributors supported which contributions and we will also add obviously some pros to that and to make sure that the group has an easy overview of the main arguments that were made either way in favor or opposing the individual options that were put to the community.

And that's something that we would like to conclude by the end of this week. So for our final call this year on the 21st of September or sorry December and we'll have the document put in front of us and be able to start working on that or at last join up a work plan based on the document.

If there any comments or questions or suggestions on the document or how it would look like or should look you're very welcome to either submit them here or in the chat or drop me an email and I see that (Anna Beth) has her hand up. So (Anna Beth) over to you.

Bart Boswinkel: (Anna Beth) we can't hear you. Probably you have to un-mute.

(Anna Beth Lan): Better now do you hear me?

Bart Boswinkel: I can hear you now yes.

(Anna Beth Lan): Can you hear me? Good okay. Thank you Lars and Bart for doing this work I know it's a lot and there is a lot of submissions and we should be very grateful for that that people are interested and feeling engaged in these questions.

But I'll see if similarly that it's really difficult to choose to pose the right question and if you look at the answers that have been submitted in my view it's obvious that we perhaps haven't really managed to make the questions clear enough.

So if you look into the (offer) especially on some of the groups or some of the questions it seems like they are answering two different things. So in my view especially there is question three it seems like we have posed it in a way that at least in my view is that was not what the intention was to ask.

And therefore we have got the questions and some of the answers and I look through the question and seeing the real meaning of the question but some other questions really ask us but why do you ask this it's obvious that it can't be this way.

So perhaps we should take that into consideration when we go through the questions Lars.

Bart Boswinkel: (Anna Beth) this is Bart.

(Anna Beth Lan): Hello.

Bart Boswinkel: May I suggest that say I've noted your concern and I think this is a very valid and important point because it's about the validity of the survey et cetera. But I think the only time to address and answer your concern and address your concern and answer your question is at the time when you have a complete

overview of the responses because say it could be that say it's just a misinterpretation by one or two of the respondents or it's really say the construct of the survey is not very good or is not good enough.

And that would say something to the validity of the answers as well. But my suggestion is that Lars and I prepared a - because that will just be a factual summary and with the reference through the responses and then based on that that we visit your point.

(Anna Beth Lan): It's (Anna Beth) again. Yes thank you Bart that would be good. And I raised my questions in writing to Lars and my concern is that what we are looking into is country and territory names only.

And those who are originated from the (ISO 3160) (clique). So when we ask for the question especially the question three when we ask about the no restriction or support from government it's the court that should not be in non (fictional) government support for all three articles.

What we are asking about is the three articles on the (ISO) only not for the three letter character strings as a whole. And I don't think that we have made that clear enough. Do you understand what my concern is?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes I do but I think it could be the interpretation. Again as I said of one of the respondents. It could be say if it's across the board say you have another issue and probably say in say analyzing the summary because that's something for the working group to do is this may come up as an answer or as an issue for further...

(Anna Beth Lan): Okay then I just raised my concern and now you know about it and that's the main thing. Thank you very much Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Because if say just to be on the safe side is if we do it now we start already interpreting responses and might - so our suggestion is first collect all the answers and then start the analysis based on all the response received.

(Anna Beth Lan): Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Other questions come relating to this. (Gregory) you've got your hand up and (Carlos) has his hand up. (Gregory) go ahead. (Gregory) you are on mute so please un-mute or type your question/comment into the chat.

(Gregory): My question in general we see all the presenters plus unfortunately I know your voice Bart they're easy for me to understand Bart Boswinkel. But on (unintelligible) we saw that (Anna) was right and she spoke and we hear her.

In the case of organizers we don't recognize who is the speaker. Could you please describe this is supposed to give us information or is the speaker from organized. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart. (Gregory) what do you mean speaker along organized so I didn't understand.

(Gregory): So when - no, no, no we are - we have participants and we saw that or we see that one of the participants has raised his hand and the speaker we hear the speaker but in case of organizers we don't see who speaks.

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Yes I'll - we'll make sure that this happens this is Bart for the record. We'll - we will list our name again as said and as naturally requested for the record. Thank you (Gregory). (Carlos).

(Carlos Gutierrez): Yes thank you Bart this is (Carlos Gutierrez) for the record. Thank you (Anna Beth) for your question and I fully understand your worry. We really

have to analyze all responses because in the case of Switzerland for example they came up with at least another five lists, international lists.

And so we are going to be very, very careful in this issue. It's a pity that (Jorge Cantu) is not here but that was the question I was going to put forward to him.

If we are going to include more lists than just the (ISO) list we have been using but I agree with Bart we have to deal carefully and I recognize that some people mentioned that this is just only a list, this is a standard this is not common law et cetera, et cetera.

So we really are going to pay a lot of attention to the comments and we will have to define what is a list, what is a standard, what is law and which ones are we going to apply. Thank you very much (Anna Beth).

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you (Carlos). (Yap) you've raised your hand. And (Gregory), (Carlos) would you be so kind to take down your hand unless you have an additional comment. (Yap) go ahead.

(Yap Akaziz): Yes I just want to make a remark about the other list. There are lots of lists and the lists are (unintelligible) and some people have asked me formally whether I knew of the list and (unintelligible) and I'm actually surprised that nobody actually put in the answers.

(Unintelligible) and I don't think that all the questions are final so and more of the suggestions are probably not - people (unintelligible). I thought that in the company letter only said that these (unintelligible) questions but please fill in what other thoughts you had and so I was actually respecting people to fill in - come up with all of this.

So I guess we do a discussion of when we were talking about these things these things will come up. (Unintelligible) be restrained by this. Thanks.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you (Yap). And this is Bart again for the record. Any other comments or issues regarding this point on the agenda? If not then we'll proceed to the next point on the agenda and that is - I'll have to scroll back up or no sorry excuse me scroll down.

It's the face to face meeting at ICANN 55 in Marrakech. I just want to draw your attention the following is this will be the first meeting A according to the new ICANN meeting strategy.

This means that at 5:00 I'd say that's at least my understanding on Monday at 5:00 pm until 6:30 pm local time there will be a public forum, a new format of the public forum according to the schedule.

This usually was the time for a ccNSO, GNSO council meeting. As this would overlap with the say public forum of this meeting but also in future meetings it is highly likely that the ccNSO, GNSO councils will meet at another time on that day and after some say based on so where we are this will most likely be again and this will be a revisit of the previous format will be a lunch meeting on Monday.

So that might impact the scheduled time of the CTN which was most I think conveniently for all of you would start at 11:30. After some discussion and trying to compare say the notes of the different groups it is also very clear that Sunday and/or Saturday will not be available due to the GNSO council workshops, due to ccNSO working groups and due to the large meetings and the GAC meetings on Saturday and Sunday.

So our proposal is to look at a time right after the public or after the opening ceremony somewhere starting around 10:30 local time for this group if that doesn't overlap with the opening ceremony until noon.

This would allow those of you who are on any of the councils to attend the council and the afternoon would be free for the hot topics and the public forum.

So this was just a heads up of potential shifts of time and date but we'll suggest some timing at a later stage but so just so you were aware. So alternatively but I assume this is as a lower priority the only feasible time we see is on Thursday morning.

But my understanding is that preferably the CTN wants to meet on Monday and on Monday morning in order to allow to attend the high level or the high impact topics and the public forum.

That's all with regard to the ICANN face to face meeting 55 so it's more a scheduling issue than anything else. And we also assumed that we want to have, you want to have 1-1/2 hours as usual at face to face meetings.

Any questions, comments relating to this point? No questions, comments okay thank you very much. Confirmation of next meeting. Lars do you want to say anything about it and/or (Carlos) or (Anna Beth) and (Paul) I know (Paul) is also on the call?

Lars Hoffman: Thank you Bart this is Lars from ICANN staff. We sent around a note I think it was sent out to the group to sort of the next well what is now the next two meetings a suggestion was to meet on the 21st of December for the last time in this calendar year.

So that's two weeks from now. That might be a good time to look at the overview paper that has - will by then be prepared by (Scott) and potentially raise any issues along the lines that (Anna Beth) raised today so we could look at that during the call.

And then the next meeting I suggested to be the 11th of January which is the second Monday of 2016 and then start from an onwards (unintelligible) down

on the substantive work on the three letter codes and continue bi-weekly from then on out.

That's all from me. Anything else to be raised I'm happy to pass on the microphone thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you Lars. Any questions, comments relating to the next meeting days? The only thing is what I see is affirmative. Two people raised - (Anna Beth) go ahead please.

(Anna Beth Lan): This is (Anna Beth Lan). I just wonder I read the questions on my thing but I am not sure what he's asking. Could you have a look at that question on the chat?

Bart Boswinkel: Is it possible to conduct a poll when we have ability to check what is going on at other groups? (Maxim) its - I'm not clear it's about the time of the meeting during Morocco. Okay thank you (Maxim).

(Anna Beth Lan): Okay I see.

Bart Boswinkel: To do it, do the poll yes that would be possible and as I said we will look into it. This was just a pre-warning that the almost usual time at 11:30 will not work but we'll try as soon as we have more insight into the main schedule et cetera we'll get back to you but this was just a pre-warning that things will change. Thank you.

(Gregory) you have your hand up please go ahead.

(Gregory): Yes let's ask once more the (organization). What kind of organization or community you need. Maybe I want to say (unintelligible) maybe you need something (unintelligible) including the (unintelligible) the measurement organization or just (unintelligible).

Bart Boswinkel: This is - even the representative is probably too high. This is as I said on - as we said on previous calls this is an informal poll and it's targeted at a broad community.

So it's not a true survey with pure representatives or say in say organizations that deal with this issue in a country. It's not like the survey the study group did in cooperation with what was it the - not the OACD but the other one.

Lars Hoffman: (Unesco) Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes (Unesco). So that was a very rigid in the sense of representation et cetera. This is just looking at the sense of people involved in the community in the - within the say the GNSO, the GNSO stakeholder groups, within the GAC, within the ccNSO et cetera.

So it's just as somebody else said this is just an informal or (Yap) said it, this is an informal query across the community to assist the working group to have a sense of direction of travel of some of the community members and have a - as a starting point for further discussion. Does that answer your question (Gregory)?

(Gregory): So (unintelligible).

Bart Boswinkel: Sorry I didn't understand you.

(Gregory): Can we say that the mentioning of the temperatures?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes something like this yes and it's not conclusive. Say this is just a starting point for the discussion which will then go say the working group will discuss it and any conclusions, recommendations based on it will go into next report if any and that will be again shared with the community and sort for input.

This is just taking yes the temperature of the room. Does that answer your question (Gregory)? Okay thank you. Now as such I think we are at the any other business.

Any other business for people want to raise, any comments, questions. I see (Carlos) is typing. That's all, you're welcome. And I thank you very much all for attending the call and hopefully next time we'll - it will not be as much a staff run call as today. Thank you very much.

Woman 1: You did a great job.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye-bye.

Woman 1: Bye.

Man 1: Bye all.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Melanie) you may now stop the recordings. Thank you (unintelligible).

END