ICANN
Transcription
Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Country/Territory Names as tLDs
Tuesday, 23 May 2017 at 20:00 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: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ctn-23may17-en.mp3

AC Recording: https://participate.icann.org/p6vrwi2pkhm/

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Attendees:

ccNSO:
Annebeth Lange, .no
Grigori Saghyan, .am
Mirjana Tasic, .rs
Nick Wenban-Smith, .cymru
Rosalía Morales, .cr

GNSO:
Griffin Barnett, IPC
Heather Forrest, IPC (co-Chair)
Maxim Alzoba, NTAG

Additional Members:
None

On Audio Only:
Carlos Raul Gutierrez, NomCom (co-chair)

Apologies:
Susan Payne, Japp Akkerjuis, Colin O'Brien, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Sebastien Pensis

ICANN Staff:
Marika Konings
Emily Barabas
Joke Braeken
Steve Chan
Bart Boswinkel
Patrick Jones
Julie Bisland

Julie Bisland: Well good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone and welcome to the CWG on Country and Territory Names as TLD's meeting on the 23rd of May 2017.

On the call today we have Annebeth Lange, Emily Barabas, Griffin Barnett, Grigori Saghyan, Heather Forrest, Marika Konings, Maxim Alzoba, Mirjana Tasic, Nick Wenban-Smith, Patrick Jones, Rosalia Morales, Steve Chan.

We have apologies from Susan Payne, Jaap Akkerhuis, Colin O'Brien. And from staff we have Joke Braeken, Steve Chan, Emily Barabas, 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 would turn it over to our chair. Please begin.

Bart Boswinkel: Annebeth, (unintelligible), please go ahead.

Annebeth Lange: Okay, I can start. This is Annebeth for the record. And since we haven't decided who to run this call from the chair's point of view, I think that it would be a good idea that you start Bart for what you have done in the start and then we can go on from there.

We just have to summarize what are coming from the - on the comments on the interim report and then we can have a discussion afterwards if that's okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, okay thank you Annebeth. (Julie) could you change the document please that you put on the final draft? And then I'm going to - as soon as it's done I'll - it's scrollable and if you could go -- and it's a very large document by now – if you could scroll almost to the last page, Page 86 – or no, 98, sorry. Getting late in the evening.

And the reason for doing this is 98 starts with the analysis of the comments. First of all say based on the public comment we received 15 comments different from all across the community, so that's a good thing, say ranging from people with gTLD/GNSO background through the ccNSO, ALAC, and GAC. So quite a mix, so in that sense it's truly a cross-community effort. So that's one.

Secondly if you look - and this is what we've done as staff. We summarize all the comments received, and we categorize them probably in three buckets. So the first bucket was on the recommendations themselves, the recommendations of the CCWG.

And that was clearly say the question to the public when the working group launched its public comment procedure. So that's on the full recommendations and in particular on the recommendations 3A, B, and C. So that's one.

A second set of comments in which we - or a second bucket we identified was on the text of the interim report itself. And finally the third bucket was on the proposal's conclusions and rationales with respect to the use of two-letter codes, three-letter codes and the full names of country and territories as TLDs.

Now I want to focus first on the recommendations and comments we received. And one of the things we drafted a table to more or less capture the (different) comments received. And you can see say a lot of people did not even comment on the recommendations themselves.

But say from those who commented on the recommendations the majority was clearly in favor of closure of the CWG after the public comment, and so in support of that recommendation, also in support of a consolidated effort, community effort after closure, so the work in this area should continue and also in support of an all-inclusive dialogue. So that's recommendation four.

Now if you look at recommendations A, B, and C, support is just as diverse as within the working group itself. So based on this analysis staff suggests let's say we leave as it is and let's say the chartering organizations and the broader group should have this - have a further discussion how they want to structure future work in this area because I think it's very clear from the comments received that future work is needed and welcome by the community.

So that's with respect to the comments received on the recommendations. And you will see this in the - say this proposal from staff is reflected in the language around the recommendations themselves. So that's with respect to this bit. Any questions on this part?

Seeing none then I'll go into the second list. So as I said we as staff identified two other buckets. Say one was on the text itself. And the third bucket was on the proposals or conclusions, observations, in the text around the use of two-letter, three-letter, and full names of country and territories.

And with respect to the text itself, we again looked at it say from the comments received. There is no suggestion to change any text itself. Somewhere it will (unintelligible) but after again going over the comments we as staff concluded the suggestions were more about the use of two- and three-letter codes than on the text in the document itself.

So in principle that bucket is empty. The only thing is employer information. Although Jaap is not attending the call, I received an e-mail this morning

where he suggests to clarify parts of the - I would say the framed text in Section I.

So in the next version of the document I'll include that suggested change. It's minor. It doesn't affect the meaning of it. But it hopefully clarifies that based on the use and say of ISO 3166. So that's not just for this working group but for other working groups as well might be relevant. So that's with respect to the text.

If you look at the recommendations again, is what you will see. Again there is a very diverse set of alternative or even proposals how to deal with the two-letter codes. And what we suggest as staff is - and that's what you will see in this document. If I scroll up a bit or if you scroll up, I think you can scroll it yourself.

In the report itself, we included all the summarized comments as Annex E. And our suggestion is that say because this working group is most likely to close at or right after the Johannesburg meeting -- if you follow the reasoning -- that the next group who will deal with it is informed by all the comments received on the substantive work and have a wholesome discussion.

So they have the overview of the working group itself but also the additional comments from people who took the effort to go through it and come up with their comments. And the reason for doing this is again the substance on for example the two-letter codes is very diverse.

On the one hand side you see comments from for example the business constituency and on the other hand you see comments from for example some of the GAC representative or ccTLD representative with respect to the use of two-letter codes.

So going over that debate again is probably - will take quite some time. And the issues will not be resolved by this working group at this stage. So the

suggestion is included in the final report refer to Annex E and inform the broader community of the diverse comments and feedback received from the community.

And that's again reflected in the final - in the draft of the final report. Questions on this bit? Or comments or…? It's clear so far what I see. Nobody else.

So let me now go through the update of the final report, what we as staff have prepared. And again bear with me. We need to go to the - probably the best part is the introductory language. What you see - and unfortunately say you have received a red-line version of the interim report. There are hardly any changes in the text itself.

What we've done is say the summary we just shared with you is reflected in the language of the - say of the executive summary and in the conclusions themselves. And in the text itself there is a reference to Annex E and to the substantive comments on the use of two- and three-letter codes. So that's what we've done to date.

And we suggest that you look at the changes at your leisure. If you have any questions please respond online and we take it from there. Any questions regarding the proposed changes? I see Heather is typing. Okay and as Heather said, she'll review and follow up on the list.

The other people on the call and in the working group can do it as well and say what we could do as staff is invite everybody to do this, so at the next call (unintelligible) to agenda item four and five is at the next call we could have a first real reading of the changes of the text and the proposed way forward by the working group itself.

And if there are not two people agree, then I think we need closure of the working group itself. So the next call is – if I am correct – scheduled in two

weeks and at a other hour. That's why we're on Tuesday. And a third is scheduled for four weeks in case necessary. Annebeth you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Annebeth Lange: Yes thank you Bart. This is Annebeth (unintelligible) for the record. I just wanted to add a few comments. What we had agreed on generally now is that it is a general support for closure of the working group and also the consolidation of community efforts and that we should continue the work in an all-inclusive dialogue.

So if I have understood this in the right way, we do not really agree on how to go forward, on which way it should be discussed in the future. I suppose that when we come to Johannesburg we have to find a way to deal with this.

But just a suggestion, since I have followed the Work Track 2 and 3 in the GNSO subsequent rounds working groups, and I think it's a suggestion there that's quite wise that they had talked about a separate Work Track 5 for geographical names because what I have experienced in the time I've followed these GNSO working groups, the representatives from the GNSO community have always said that participants were all part of the community including GAC.

And ccTLDs are welcome to join any PDP working group and that their opinions should go into this geographic stuff that we are interested in, especially the country and Territory Names.

But the problem is with these other work tracks and also the plenary forum for these work tracks is that it's so many other issues discussed there. And it's teleconferences almost three times a week, and it's very difficult to follow everything.

So the suggestion has been to just make the smaller or more pointed working group for discussing the geographical names. And this might be a better way

for us as the CCs and G's and at-large and also the GAC, those that are interested in these specific questions to set aside some time to discuss these things.

So I would really like to have some comment back on what do you think about this idea. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you Annebeth. It's - I'm just looking at say this final report. Maybe – and I leave this up to the co-chairs whether or not to include it, and to the working group of course – is that the - say we propose a little bit more pointed language around Recommendation 3 in the sense of that based on the discussions of the working group itself and based on the feedback received, the format of how the next steps - or the working group is not able to come up with a recommendation on the format of next steps.

And that's more for community discussion at the Johannesburg meeting, because I think Annebeth the suggestion you just made and what was suggested by the PDP subsequent rounds, say the working group position based on the feedback received and its own discussions to either go or to support or not support that.

It's more up to the chartering organization and the respective communities whether they think it's a wise idea. So it's beyond the scope of this working group. Does that make sense to you?

Annebeth Lange: Yes, yes, of course I understand that. But since we have all these alternatives on the way to go forward, this way forward was never discussed. What we have discussed, should it be a new cross-community working group? Should it be in a ccNSO? Should it be in the GNSO?

And I think a lot of people from other communities than the GNSO felt that even if they are invited into the GNSO it's too much going on there. So they feel a little let out. It's difficult to concentrate on what they are interested in.

So perhaps at least they should discuss it in the meetings we have up to the Johannesburg meeting.

And since they are also right that the subsequent procedures PDP will hold the working session on geographic names in Johannesburg, and it will be the public forum discussing geographic names, this might be an idea that we should think about, all of us, not…

I don't mean that we should get it into the report but this is an idea that we could let sink in and consider if this could be a good way forward instead of just putting it into one of the other working texts that is too wide for us to attend properly. That was my point. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes and that's what I tried to formulate it as carefully as possible let's say that it's not up to say that say at this stage and given the feedback, it's not of the working group itself but individual members should have and could have the discussion how to move forward because it's very clear that say based on the report itself and based on where the working group was heading that a next effort is needed.

But the format needs to be decided, and that's beyond the scope of the - and there is no recommendation or uniform recommendation from the working group, and that's - so it's back to the chartering organizations and other interested stakeholders how they want to organize the next effort. I see Grigori's hand is up as well. Grigori go ahead.

Grigori Saghyan: Thank you Bart. Grigori Saghyan. Let me ask a question Bart. When these groups (unintelligible) organized (unintelligible). When this group was organized…

Bart Boswinkel: Yes?

Grigori Saghyan: …there was a clear mandate to this group.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Grigori Saghyan: Could you please define what responsibilities we had?

Bart Boswinkel: Only to prepare a paper and put on the table or we can give some
                   recommendations, which is the voice of our group.

                   Let me say the mandates of the group, if you go back it had three major
                   goals. One was check whether the policies identified were still relevant, and
                   say that's a no-brainer that's the case.

                   Then check whether a harmonized framework for the use of country and
                   territory names is feasible. And based on the direction of travel, these very
                   clear let's say – and the discussions within the group – such a framework is
                   for various reasons not feasible, at least under the current situation.

                   That's why you see the recommendations (unintelligible) but at the same time
                   say maybe other mandated group broader than the otherwise linked to other
                   efforts, etcetera, may have a chance and that's why you see the
                   recommendation. So the working group could do some recommendations in
                   the sense of how to continue. Does that answer your question Grigori?

Grigori Saghyan: What will be the result of our - this joint work? It will be some kind of
                   recommendation. If we have prepared these recommendations and we
                   suggest to follow these recommendations, it will be just a study group.

Bart Boswinkel: If you look at say the report itself, I think there is a lot of work with respect to
                   the two- and three-letter codes as we now (unintelligible) including the survey
                   as a methodology whether the views are and say - and a lot of clarity what is
                   meant by two-letter codes, etcetera, because there was a lot of myth around
                   the ISO 3166 for example.

And all that is included. That's why it's such an extensive document. So in that sense say the working group definitely did produce material and also some recommendations around or conclusions around the two-letter codes which at this stage say some within the community go back to, but that's – yeah, that's where it's at.

Grigori Saghyan: Okay thank you. But I think we can do more concrete recommendations maybe, more stronger say our opinion. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Annebeth, any other comments on this one?

Annebeth Lange: It's Annebeth here. Yes and I think that this is the way we have to go forward. So if everybody goes into their interim report until the next meeting, that would be good. And if we have something to say, do it on the list. And as you say, Bart, that – and also Heather – that of course it's not our mandate to tell the subsequent round how they should discuss geographical names.

But I agree that this report we have done, it gives a good background for the next round, whoever going to discuss it and in whatever form to not start on scratch again. We have given them something, even if we can't give any clear recommendations.

So I just recommend that everyone reads the report again and the recommendations and also the input and make up their mind to how to go forward. Thank you for your effort.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you. Any other questions, comments…? If not, then the next call is I believe in two weeks. You'll be invited, and we'll send - on behalf of staff we'll send out a note so please check the changes and the recommendations.

Ah, there it is in two weeks on June the 6th at 5:00 a.m. UTC. And again 60 minutes. Thank you very much and…

Annebeth Lange: Thank you so much Bart for doing this and summarize it and bye everybody.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes okay, thank you. Bye-bye.

Annebeth Lange: Bye-bye.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye.

Grigori Saghyan: Bart, Bart, wait. Bart, could you please send the recommendation, the report?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes of course, but it was sent yesterday as well. But I'll send it out again.

Woman: Good.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye all.

Woman: Bye-bye.

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

                                    END