
ABU DHABI – ccNSO PDP Working Group on Retirement of ccTLDs
Thursday, November 2, 2017 – 13:30 to 15:00 GST
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: November 2nd, 2017. ccNSO PDP on Retirement Working Group, Capital Suite 6, 1:30 p.m.

NIGEL ROBERTS: We won't be starting on time – probably an extra five minutes or so. I need to try to get myself into the Adobe Room to see the documents.

Well, I'm sorry to tell you that this is as much light as we're going to have. If you give me a moment or so, as I said – and of course, the screen is very small by comparison to what we usually have. Bart has recommended that we all use the Adobe Room to see the documents. I'm just in the process of trying to get my computer to get into the Adobe Room. There's no easy link to the Adobe Room.

BART BOSWINKEL: Apologies for sending the documents late. As you will see, and I just explained, Peter asked it before some of you arrived. Most of it is an update of the documents that have been shared two or three weeks ago. I'll run you through it as we discuss the

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

terminology document. I've made some changes based on Peter's and others comments. The second one is the second reading of the scenario around the change of a name of a country or territory. There was a small added to it – I will explain it – that was based on Kim Davies's comment that said they interact with ccTLDs prior to the formal decision-making. So that's an informal consultation that's now also included.

The real new one is the other scenarios. I started to look into it. If you look, say, for historical analysis, there is one scenario that is extremely relevant. That is when a country or territory name is removed from the list, and then the code element is moved to the transitional list or another list because it's an interesting observation around what a transitional list is. The other categories identified by the group are not effectively relevant for historical purposes.

Let's go for the documents first. Are you [right in]? Or you can use mine.

NIGEL ROBERTS: I think I'm going to have to use yours, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: [inaudible]

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL: We [inaudible].

NIGEL ROBERTS: Kim?

KIM CARLSON: Yeah, [inaudible]

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah. Thank you for attending this meeting of the Retirement Policy Development Process. I still go some people coming in. If you'd like to take a seat, that would be great. For those of you who are members and participants of the PDP Working Group – and that does include you, Ann-Cathrin – can you please go around the table, and starting with Patricia, give your name and say who you are? One or the other.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Patricio Poblete from NIC Chile.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] from the .nz registry.

BARRACK OTIENO: Barrack Otieno from AFTLD.

SVITLANA TKACHENKO: Svitlana Tkachenko from the .ua ccTLD.

ANN-CATHRIN MARCUSSEN: Ann-Cathrin Marcussen from .no.

ALLAN MCGILLIVRAY: Allan McGillivray from .ca.

DEBBIE MONAHAN: Debbie Monahan, .nz.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Joke Braeken, ccNSO Secretariat.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Nigel Roberts, .gg.

BART BOSWINKEL: Bart Boswinkel, ccNSO Secretariat.

KIM CARLSON: Kim Carlson, ICANN Org.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Jaap Akkerhuis, MA 3166.

PETER VERGOTE: Peter Vergote, .be.

MARTIN BOYLE: Martin Boyle, .uk.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Nick Wenban-Smith, .uk.

PIERRE OUEDRAOGO: Pierre Ouedraogo, .bf.

PETER KOCH: Peter Koch, .de.

ROBERT MARTIN-LEGENE: Robert Martin-Legene, PCH.

MIRJANA TASIC: Mirjana Tasic, administrator of .yu, which doesn't exist anymore, and .rs now.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And me, from Russia. I am an administrator of .su that Bart discussed here. If it's possible, if you have time, may I say some words about it? Maybe later, maybe now. I don't know.

I just want to introduce the domain .su, Soviet Union, and say that WSIS registry from the year 1991. That was before ICANN was founded, by the way. Now we still have about 120,000 domains still alive and a live business project and science projects like [inaudible] University and Moscow State University on .su. We are very worried about the retirement of [inaudible]. We understand that the process is needed in all environment, but in .su we think that we should discuss, not only in the ICANN community but in the Administrator and Administration Society in .su zone about the initiating of the retirement process in such a [live] and huge zones like .su. Thank you.

NIGEL ROBERTS: I don't mean to cut you off. I will give you plenty of opportunity under AOB. We'll welcome both of you with the experience of .su and .yu. It's exactly the experience that we need in this working group. If you're not already members or participants of the working group, then please do send Joke here an e-mail. We'll see what we can do to get you on.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I already sent it to Bart.

NIGEL ROBERTS: And I'm referring not just to you but anyone who's around this table. If you're not already a member participant, please do e-mail Joke.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Wafa Dahmani, .tn, is joining us remotely. We have received apologies from Peter Van Roste, Michele Neylon, and Maureen Hilyard.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Did you mention Eberhard?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Eberhard Lisse. Thank you.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you very much. So we've done the welcome and the roll call. Action items. Action 31 is pretty much ongoing, I believe: access to the 3166 standard, which is by e-mailing Jaap.

Jaap, how many people have asked you for that?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: I didn't count, but about 10 or 12 people, I think. I can give a figure later.

NIGEL ROBERTS: No, it was just for interest. If I already haven't done so, perhaps I should do it as well because it'd be very helpful. So if you haven't already got a copy of the ISO 3166 standard, thanks to Jaap's kind interventions, then please do give him an e-mail and so on.

You're right about not being able to see the screen very well.

Action Item 12: Update the glossary document. See Item 3.

Bart, is that something you're able to speak to?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. It's just as an action item, and the discussion is on effectively the next agenda item. With respect to the other action item, I think this is the last time that I'll include it on the agenda. By now, everybody should be aware that the ISO 3166 standard is available. For those who don't have it yet, please contact Jaap. This is the last time you'll see it back on the action item list.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you. We now come onto the item of glossary terminology update and discussion. You should now have a copy of this, which is now coming on-screen. I'm going to have to strain my eyes out. Bart, do you have something to...?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. As I said, based on the discussion – oh, it's difficult. Can you scroll down, Kim?

There it is. Yeah, takes a little bit of time.

I've made some changes to it based on the discussion on the last call. What is interesting, especially in this second part, around the – I haven't touched the IANA naming function terminology. I've been working on, after discussion, the terminology in the context of the ISO 3166 standard itself. That is starting on page 2, I believe. Yeah. So going from unassigned, assigned, not defined. What I've done is the reservation of code elements. That's a term used – I've added that term – used in the ISO standard itself with a reference to the section "Reallocation Period" because it's mentioned.

Transitional reserve is an interesting one and we'll come to discuss it. It is used and defined in the glossary of the ISO 3166 country online browsing platform. It is not defined in the standard itself.

Go ahead, Peter.

PETER KOCH:

Peter Koch, .de. I'm a bit concerned about the usage of the word "defined" here. I would like to suggest that we avoid any impression that these different levels or categories of reservation bear any meaning beyond what is in the reserve list that is opaque to the outside, at least from the standards point of view.

So I understand what this means in the context of this document, but assuming that this goes outside, I suggest that this is not the point in time to make predeterminations on how strongly we believe in the internal status of the MA's list.

BART BOSWINKEL:

I fully agree with you, but there is probably even a matter issue which we'll encounter. I noticed during the discussions with Nigel and Eberhard, and even the discussions between them, that we say that a lot of people start to mix up terminology from one category – for example, from around the ISO 3166 – and impose it on our work around the retirement of ccTLDs; for example, say, exception reserved or as if there is something else. It has a specific meaning within the context of the ISO 3166, but if we impose it on, say, the terminology we use in the context of

IANA or PTI transactions, it starts to have a completely different meaning. You lose the sense that was defined or that is used in the ISO 3166.

So I agree. “Define” might be too strong a word. At the same time, it is used as such within the standard and/or the online browsing platform.

PETER KOCH:

Thanks, Bart. The online browsing platform is a convenience tool provided by the ISO 3166 MA. To the best of my knowledge, the use of terms there does not bear any formal meaning in terms of defining or creating a formal status, which should be up to the standard itself.

Yes, the same semantics are used there, but I want to avoid here is the impression that members of this group – or even worse, the outside – have these five or six status models which at least the standard doesn’t support, unless we get different advice from the MA or from the ISO technical committee in charge of the standard.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Thank you, Peter. That’s actually a very good point. We’re going to come to Jaap and Bart in a second. The purpose of this document is that we in our own work – it’s a living document, so

it will be edited from time to time when we come across problems. We need to be all speaking and meaning the same thing when we use the same expressions. It may turn out that some terms are not even needed to be used, even though they appear to be common. We've had this happen before; the word "redelegation," for example, in previous work."

The main thing that we've got to do here is to keep clear in our mind that the list of existing ccTLDs and the list of assigned code elements in the ISO 3166-1 are not exactly the same. There are several ccTLDs that exist that are not on that list, including .uk, I believe, apparently. .gg used to be not on the list and now is on the list.

Jaap, can you help us up here? You looked like you had something to say.

JAAP AKKERHUIS:

There will be a meeting of the MA in December. I could bring up what the opinion is from the MA and the ISO on how to deal as loosely as possible about this fact without [inaudible]. But the problem is that ISO's – which I warned about already – lawyers [refuse] to answer [ICANN]. So they are very reluctant to do firm appointments about to do the interpretation of the standards, or, really specifically, the details in there. We had that before.

I will tell them at that meeting about what transpired here in ICANN about retirement, so at least they'll be aware it's happening and that we're working on this.

BART BOSWINKEL: I think what might be useful is, if you look at the terminology in both, the glossary around the browsing platform and what is used in the document itself, that parts are overlapping and parts are not similar. That is creating confusion.

Peter, I do understand, but if people start looking at it and base their – because part of what is in the online browsing platform is what is almost the basis for delegation as well. They will include the new assigned codes.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: And we talk about the website. Actually, two weeks ago, part of the [clause] is that because of different people are [reading] things into it which are not there. I will try to bring this up again, this point. The glossary is done not by the MA itself. It's just owned by the PI people. We all know how that goes.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah. Thank you. We know how that works. Does everybody around the table know what the online browsing platform is?

Who doesn't? Yeah. Well, I'll defer to Jaap to give a full and detailed explanation, but –

BART BOSWINKEL: Well –

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah?

BART BOSWINKEL: To make it easier, I'll send a link to the online browsing platform so you can check it for yourself.

NIGEL ROBERTS: In short, up until a few years ago – I'm sure you can tell us exactly when – changes to the ISO 3166-1 standard were notified by way of newsletters. I don't know how many there have been – five, six, ten – something like that. Whenever a new code was introduced or a code was deleted, or a definition of a code, in the case of gb in 2006 was made, they would be notified by these newsletters. They stopped publishing the newsletters, and now it's done by an online browsing platform.

Jaap, do you have anything to add to that?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Well, people are really interested. The online browsing platform is only giving a subset of the information which is in the table and which is in full standard. To get the real, full standard, get the real table, you can get a subscription model of getting – then you get automatically all the updates in a couple of different forms. You can get them in .doc to import a new database.

I guess, for our work, whatever is public there is sufficient for –

BART BOSWINKEL: [inaudible]

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Yeah. The newsletters are also available still somewhere on the site if people really want to go back into the history.

BART BOSWINKEL: I think that's the final point. Going back to what you said, could the online browsing platform be considered an authoritative source for the assignment of [inaudible] or for the code elements?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Yes.

BART BOSWINKEL: And the unassignment. I think that is an important notification, so in that sense we should look at what is on the online browsing platform.

PETER KOCH: Thank you, Bart and Jaap. I don't want to drive this to the extreme here. First of all, I think getting an answer from the MA that we can't tell would be significant information to our process and not a failure. What I'm pointing at here is the exact words and the power of the online browsing platform to define these terms, which I don't see. I understand that this is now the new tool replacing the newsletters, which is okay, but it is similar to the problem we had with the IANA registry, where certain words appeared that you, Nigel, pointed out a couple of times.

NIGEL ROBERTS: [inaudible]

PETER KOCH: Exactly. Then they were recently changed, as we learned, so we don't take these parts as [inaudible]. So there's an authoritative part in there which might be the list of assigned code elements. Actually, we don't really know about the status of the reserve list. It is published there, but the standard doesn't describe this, doesn't task the MA.

I'm just trying to be careful here. A remark in terms of a footnote or something would be perfectly fine in the document, saying that this is the online browsing platform under the auspices of the MA. It's not from the standard. The content, the list, is okay. I understand that, but we need to make this distinction so we don't step on our own feet in the future. Thank you.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Peter, actually that's extremely helpful. I think the one thing that emerged from this – I'm going to take a sounding as to whether or not we can agree to this – Peter, if you think I'm expressing it well, please focus on my omissions, if you'd like.

I think one thing that we can take from this – the information that we just had and so on – is that the online browsing platform is a mechanism by which we can authoritatively be notified of a change to the two-letter code elements. But we will not and cannot take phrases and so on defined or used on the online browsing platform as being an authoritative definition of those phrases.

I see Jaap is nodding vigorously here. Do you want to say something?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: The basic authoritative text is the standard. The text will [inaudible] clarification trying to be helpful for the people who don't have the standard. But if you really want to be speaking more in the legal sense of what is authoritative, you should go to the standard. That's why the [inaudible] available.

BART BOSWINKEL: And they are included.

NIGEL ROBERTS: What I'm thinking of is not just our work, which is extremely helpful to have the standard, but what the IANA or future generations will use as a trigger to create or to start the process of retirement of new or retiring ccTLDs.

At this point in time, the notification appears to be the online browsing platform to the world, but the standard is what's defined. Is that right?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: The text of the standard is what authoritative is. There is only one section which is the list of all assigned things, and that's the open browsing platform.

Just for people who want to be notified, you actually can, in the platform you can put on a little thing and actually [inaudible]

and anybody on the planet can get automatically – whenever it updates, you get it in the mail.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Without belaboring this, I think we actually have our trigger for the process of entering retirement. It's when there's a change of this nature.

Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL No, it's fine. I'll include the note as said by Jaap and say the authoritative text around the sections is in the standard itself. The terminology in the online browsing platform is just illustrative and clarification. Changes on the online browsing platform is authoritative with respect to changes of effectively Section 8.6 in the standard. So the assignments.

[inaudible]?

NIGEL ROBERTS: The audio was a bit bad, but if you said that the online browsing form is only informing about the assignments, then that's okay. The reservations and the inner things and the reading of the tea leaves is something that we can't really rely upon there.

As we know, the reservation list is not part of the published standard. The assignment list is. This is a significant difference. Thank you.

JAAP AKKERHUIS:

You will notice that the platform actually makes a difference between official and articles. The articles have what the reservation is. They also promised me that – I don't know when it's going to happen – to also include the user assigned codes, which I mentioned, in the standard but not on the browsing platform. When this will happen, I don't know. But that's the idea.

Note what we said about the authoritative text is not only the browsing platform but actually everything on the website, which is directly available, because, even the online browsing platform, if you do code, I think they now clean up. There used to be a difference between the glossary [inaudible] [OBPI] and the other glossaries. I think they now actually link them together. Even inside the website, there are differences. Unexplainable.

BART BOSWINKEL:

[One] more question, and then we'll leave it as it is because I think we're now at the level we want to be with respect to the

glossary. If you could get back to this group with the results of the meeting in early December around this particular topic whenever that would be, that'd probably be most helpful. Then we'll have the latest with respect to the terminology and how to treat it and then a way forward.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Thank you for that. I presume that deals with the item of glossary in this meeting.

Before we move onto the next item, if we could have the agenda while I'm saying this, many of you who've been on the calls know we have a practice of what I call the soft stop at an hour. So the meetings are generally an hour long, and we allocate an hour-and-a-half so that we have plenty of time if we get into an interesting discussion to up to the full 90 minutes if need be.

How do people feel about the length of the meeting here today? Are you happy to – it'll be about another half-an-hour. We've done about half-an-hour now. And –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

[inaudible]

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah. Or do you want to go through the full allocated hour-and-a-half?

Any strong opinions either way?

Apparently not. Let's just go through the agenda then. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

NIGEL ROBERTS: Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE: While still on Item – is it 3? – of the agenda, there are two documents. I was struggling to identify the purpose of having two documents. There's the document overview relevant terms and terminology, and then there was the second November terminology glossary of version three. Both seem to be covering very similar if not identical material. If they've got separate purposes, then I'd feel a little bit nervous at having a lot of shared content without having one side or the other being the identified core text. If we don't need two documents, then it's always safer to only have one. But there might well be an underlying deep purpose, and Bart is about to tell me.

BART BOSWINKEL: One was a redline and the other one was the clean version. That was the underlying purpose. At least that was the intention. We discussed one on the previous call, and there were some changes made. That's what we went through. The second version is the clean version of the redline version.

Does that make sense to you? And the clean version of the redline version, where the changes have been adopted.

MARTIN BOYLE: Okay. I didn't catch that when I was looking at the documents. They just looked like separate documents, and neither of them in my memory had clearly marked that it was a redline version. The two titles of the documents were significantly different.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay. So the conclusion I have from that is we have one document, and it's going to be clarified. Is that right?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Good. With that, we'll move on to the next item, which is: change of name scenario, second reading of the analysis.

Who's going to – Bart, you want to speak to this at all? Is this the document you're referring to, Martin, by any chance? No.

BART BOSWINKEL:

We've discussed this. This was introduced in the previous call. Again, effectively the .zr and the .tp cases with the documentation around it.

I can't see the changes but that's because it's a PDF, probably.

Kim Davies made the remark that IANA – I took it as relevant because he made that remark – now PTI (in the early days, IANA) would contact the potential retiring ccTLD manager prior to the official decisions by the ICANN Board because that was not clear. If you go to the official reports on it, it said the IANA report itself and then Board minutes around the retirement. It's relevant in the context of who initiates the process of retirement and when. The initial initiating effect that is clear is the change of the status from assigned to something else on the ISO 3166 list.

The next step is that retirement will start at one point, but it needs to be initiated. Who initiates it and when is unclear, at least in historical cases, because, if you look at the documents, you may have the view that it's initiated by the ICANN Board. But effectively, there are a lot of informal contacts going on prior to the official documentation of the [inaudible].

Maybe you can allude to it?

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you, Bart. I'd like to throw this open to the floor to get a wide range of views on this particular point within this document because this is key: the initiating event.

Does anybody have any views that they'd like to contribute on this at this point? Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks, Chair. This isn't a view. It's really just a question as to what message is trying to be got over in this Section 3, where it says it was pointed out – this in the case of retirement – and then the fact that IANA staff had informal conversations. That's what it says in the highlighted red text there.

It's not clear to me that IANA staff having informed conversations would or could or should be considered as a trigger for a retirement process. So I'd like to get some better understanding of what message we're trying to get over in this particular phrase because I think we need to make sure that we're specifically referencing what triggered it.

I say that because, in the following paragraph, there is then a specific reference to a Board decision, and that’s the bit that then starts interesting me. Thank you, Chair.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you, Martin. This the whole point. We want to really get to the bottom of the initiating event.

Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: It’s probably unfortunately, Kim [inaudible]. He just arrived. May I suggest either we address it on our next call when we move it forward because now you’re getting into the understanding of how it works. Or maybe what we’re discussing is what you said on the last call around that IANA staff has contacted – I think it was the .tp case – the ccTLD manager before the Board discussions and the Board decisions around the retirement.

I think Martin’s question is, “What triggered that discussion, and would that have been the initiation event? Or should it be considered an initiation event from you end of the retirement process?”

NIGEL ROBERTS: Kim, if you could find somewhere to squeeze in.

KIM DAVIES:

Thanks for the question. Firstly, apologies for being late. I think the very first trigger for the process in any formal sense is notification from ISO that the ISO standard has changed. Even then, we're typically aware of this in advance via Jaap because we're of the machinations with the ISO committee that you ask what the formal trigger is. There's nothing consistently applied there. Whenever there's a change to the ISO standard, we update an internal database. For example, if a new code is added, we add it to the IANA root zone database that's simply available but not delegated. But it's really been on a case by case basis.

We typically have a personal relationship with almost every ccTLD manager around. Usually we know the parties. We would probably informally inquire with them as to what their plans are once a status change has happened. It's evolved organically from there.

But I don't think I can really point to a consistent approach, given that there's been so few data points. I think, with the few I've been involved with, it has not been a regimented checklist kind of approach – that we do this, then we do that, and we do that. Each case has been somewhat different.

I don't know if that helps clarify if there's little clarity there.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Garth, I notice that you don't have the microphone. I think we have recordings and remote participants. As a member, can you squeeze in? I'm very pleased to see so many people in this room, but it's obviously insufficiently sized.

No, Garth, we need you on the microphone for the remote participation.

GARTH MILLER: Can you hear me now? If I understand the question correctly, it was directly related to .tp and .tl. Is that correct? And I can say that the initiative actually came from government, within the ministry, because some of the large ISPs and things in the country – Timor Telecom – are still using .tp. The former IANA information was incorrect for .tp as far as the president being the registered contact who had nothing to do with it. So the government was very concerned internally that the IANA details were incorrect. There was political pressure in the country, saying, "Why are you in charge of this whole thing?"

So in this particular case, the desire to retire very clearly came from within government to avoid conflict inside Timor's environment, specifically since the largest and only ISP in the

country was using .tp and the president was named for a contact for it and that was creating some issues.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you, Garth. I have Jaap on the list.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Well, it's a bit of an accident. At that time, when .tl started to be there, I was actually giving [inaudible] to the Pacific ccTLD manager. There was the incoming – but people from Timor – [Lester] as well – were not sure how it was. For the time being, the [U.N.] actually gave it [inaudible]. The East Timor government actually had put it under the government of the U.N. at that time because there was still some fighting going on between Indonesia and East Timor.

So it was a very complicated situation. Nobody in turn knew actually how to deal with it. I [inaudible] referred them for questions about the real domain – talk to IANA because they are the ones who have to figure this mess out. So it was complicated, all over the whole place.

Yes, there's the story about the president being in prison and being the manager of .tp at that time. He didn't [know] about it, so when he became the president, he said, "What? What are we talking about?"

So I can imagine that, actually, there were multiple triggers or none.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Very useful. I see Peter. Is there anybody else after Peter?

Okay. Peter?

PETER KOCH: Well, this is actually not on the .tl/.tp issue, but on the document. Is that okay, or should I defer?

Okay. If we go back to the introduction, I have a request for clarification. If I missed that in a previous reading, I'm sorry. I apologize. It says that one of the triggers or scenarios potentially resulting in retirement is the change of a name or the country code. That confused me a bit. All the examples examined, of course, are changes in the country code.

The only example for a name change – there have been many, many more as the astute reader of the newsletter knows – isn't followed up further. So the only other indication is that, of course, a name change might initiate a co-change, but that is outside the scope of our group. I guess we could reduce the confusion if we get rid of the name changing.

BART BOSWINKEL: You're at the top of the section, aren't you?

PETER KOCH: I am at the top of the document. One of the scenarios resulting is a change of the country name or the two-letter code. Country names change so many times every year. They do, but they don't have effects on the code assignments.

BART BOSWINKEL: I know he's right, but the interesting thing is that this was a direct copy of the discussion on the e-mail list of one of the initial states that was identified. We'll get to it, but it needs to be clarified anyway. I'd say that's why I'd include a significant change of "May require the ISO 3166." Effectively, what you're really looking at is a significant change that would change the code element. That's the next step.

But the initial part is from the working group, itself identified by the working group itself at one point.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Peter, before you come back on that, I think we need to make sure that we have got this right. You're talking about the first sentence at the top of this page. I think one of the scenarios is the change of a country name resulting in a change of the two-

letter code because there might be a change in the country name that doesn't result in a change of the two-letter code, in which case there'd be no effect on the ccTLD whatsoever.

PETER KOCH:

Thank you, Nigel. Yes, this is true, but the change in the country name may be a trigger for the ISO MA to change the code following consultations with the U.N. and so on and so forth. So it is an indirect trigger. I'm not sure that just the change in a country name preempting one what the MA decides about the code that comes out is anything that should be of concern to IANA later. The code is changed or it isn't, but who should make the determination of how significantly the country name changes? That's on the ISO MA.

BART BOSWINKEL:

That is captured when you go – scenario change of name. That was the identified scenario by the working group. The next one from assigned to transition in the reserved. From assigned to transition is [your] new code design. That's all working group language.

The next paragraph starts, “Based on these descriptions, the starting point is the end of the listing of a particular state of two-letter code country codes on the ISO 3166 in terms of the ISO

3166 standards section 7.4 alterations to country and code elements.” Second sentence says, “A significant change of name may require the ISO.” That’s where you’re really talking.

So it’s not just in the change of name, but it’s a significant change as defined by the MA. That’s the rest of the document.

PETER KOCH:

Yes, I understand that, but the question is, “How important is that for the scope of this?” We could even go back further and say, “Yes, there was a civil war in the country that made the country name change, and therefore this is an even earlier trigger.” I just don’t understand why this is in scope of this document – whatever trigger the change that the ISO MA applies.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Kim? You’ve been waiting.

KIM DAVIES:

I was going to say that I think, for us in totality, name changes are important because the name changes – the vast majority – are trivial and associated with preference changes, fundamentally. It might reflect a change in borders. It might reflect some significant alteration to the country. I think West

Germany became Germany and it's the same code, if I'm not mistaken.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That didn't happen.

KIM DAVIES: Okay. But nonetheless, I could foresee scenarios where borders change and a country name might impact the totality of IANA operations. Whether any of those scenarios would fall into a retirement scenario I'm wracking my brain about. I'm not sure. It's something we would track. It's not completely benign. I guess that's my point.

BART BOSWINKEL: Just going back to what was used – I agree with you; don't misunderstand me – these are the categories identified by this working group early on – I think in July – on the e-mail list. We agreed to start looking into it – using these scenarios. This is one of them. The rest is fairly easy. What we're going to discuss is the other potential initiating events for the retirement process. If you would look them through, you would see there are empty sets, effectively, looking at this history of it that are not well-defined. That's why we need to go back and say, "Is this is a

fruitful approach of doing this work?” looking at these scenarios for changes as defined by the working group initially.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Nick?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I got to say I do understand exactly where Peter is coming from. I know that this is the output of various e-mails and all the rest of it. But we need to be extremely specific and clear with the language we use. Just because it happened to have been said upon the list, it doesn't mean to say we don't have the power as a working group now to say, "Actually, that was a useful point at the point it was made, but it needs to be more specific and clear now," because we need to leave a record to help us actually get to somewhere useful. I think the point is, yes, of course this is a scenario. Something happens – a country changes its name – and then the code is changed as a result. There are other scenarios that we're also looking at. We're just looking at the first one. So I'm just worried about the lack of progress through this.

I do think we should make it better if we can.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Do we –

BART BOSWINKEL: That’s fairly simple, by the way.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah. Do we have a suggestion for a single initiating event? Peter, do you want to do that before I summarize?

PETER KOCH: Okay. Thank you. As far as I’m concerned, a change of the two-letter code would be sufficient and would also cover all of the details that have been worked out, except that there’s one example of .by, which was a no-op because it didn’t trigger anything. Just the country code was renamed, right? I’m sorry – just the – well, actually, it wasn’t really a country at that time. But anyway, just the entity was renamed.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you. Actually, you’re quite right. That one is a no-op because there’s no change to the code, and the code continued to represent pretty much the same territory.

BART BOSWINKEL: [That’s what I said].

NIGEL ROBERTS: But from the last intervention, what I hear is that we can even drop the word “significant.” There are two letters in the code element, and any change is significant. So it’s simply a change in a code element.

Any comments?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes. If you really [inaudible], the significant change of name of the country name may require the ISO 3166 to change the alpha code elements concerned. That is what is in the standard itself.

PETER KOCH: Yes. That is –

NIGEL ROBERTS: Just one second, Peter.

PETER KOCH: I’m sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think that we should make this document less complex. So I support strongly the proposal of our colleague here. Sorry, I

don't know your name. If something changes in two-letter codes, that's something which triggers further actions. All the other things are somehow blurring the main point. Sorry, that's my opinion.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Good point. Bart is writing that down. Peter, your turn.

PETER KOCH: I wasn't contesting the "significant." That is original language from the standard. We're not going back to that, but we are not reevaluating the maintenance agency's procedures here. The trigger for us is that the code changes, unless we have another example where just the name changes were made different. I have not found any such example here. So that would be a completely different case that we have not found any support for yet. Thank you.

NIGEL ROBERTS: If you want to attract my attention, put your hand right [inaudible] because you're in my blind spot.

Kim?

KIM DAVIES: That’s okay. Personally, I think this approach is fine, but I think we should be explicit that this relies on an assumption that any time purely a name changes, it wouldn’t result in a significant change to the underlying entity that the code represents because we’re making assumptions based on historical situations.

In the past, we’ve said we shouldn’t assume certain ways that the ISO might operate in the future, correct? Maybe I haven’t made my point clearly, because everyone is [inaudible].

NIGEL ROBERTS: Do you want to try again?

KIM DAVIES: I could foresee scenarios where the country name might change and the two-letter code doesn’t. That is a significant change that does change what the code represents. We might make an assumption that ISO would never make such a decision. I think we should just be explicit. We’re assuming that ISO would not make such a decision.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Peter?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: [inaudible] territory country is that code for ISO. Actually, a real name change that happened in the past is .tp/.tl. Other things like .su and .yu and .an are actually – this policy [in] one country replacing it with a couple others. But when the same territory changes completely, it's .tp/.tl. It was .tp because it was Portuguese. When the Portuguese, Indonesia took over. That's never been ratified by the U.N. It was fine, we settled, it became independent. Then they also wanted to get rid of the Portuguese part because there were a lot of elements they managed to [inaudible]. It was before I joined the ISO, so I don't know why they did it. But I think that was enough to [inaudible] well. If, after all this history and [bad] sentiments about what happened, [political], this is actually a reason to change it, especially when it became Timor [inaudible]. So that's actually a real name, a code change of the same territory. I haven't seen it otherwise.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Kim?

KIM DAVIES: I just want to say that I fully agree. That's my assumption moving forward, too. But if that method of operation was to change, then our assumptions would not hold.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: [inaudible] But if want me to put this forward to the... I could always ask.

NIGEL ROBERTS: This has been a very useful discussion so far. I think what it means is that this business of making sure we understand exactly what we're talking about at any one time is extremely important. If we seem to be going around in circles, we'll eventually grind small.

What I take now from the discussion so far is that there's going to be an initiating event from the IANA's perspective, from the ICANN perspective. When you're looking at the ccTLD list – not the ISO list; forget the ISO list, you start with the status that the ccTLD exists. The triggering or initiating event is to be notified of a change to the authoritative standard, which is the document that is definitive, as Jaap says – that the online browsing platform is one mechanism. We could become aware of it, but as Kim says, we have got good liaison with Jaap. We'd probably get advanced warning of this or at least we'd get an explanation in detail rather than [inaudible] and so on.

So are we all in agreement that the initiating event is a change to the two-letter code by the maintenance agency?

Anybody? Patricio, you have a comment?

PATRICIO POBLETE: I agree.

NIGEL ROBERTS: He says yes. Okay. Well, that’s actually progress. Now, Nick, would you have a comment at this point, I wonder?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I was only going to say that I totally agree with that and we should document it because the thing is that that’s the precision and consistency and a little bit of time to reflect.

Also, I’ve not had a chance to read any of things before today. We could have done with a –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Okay. Well, I just feel I’ve not really had a proper chance to think about it. Peter has put up a good point, I think –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BART BOSWINKEL: Sorry. What I suggest is I'll rewrite this one to make this clear, but this is only dealing with the change of the code elements because you've got other scenarios as well. We need to plow through them as well in the same manner.

At least this one is going back to a "significant change in the code element," resulting in that it's no longer on the assigned list anymore.

PETER KOCH: I would suggest we avoid "significant change to the code list." It's a change. Any change is significant.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah, Peter, we got that point earlier. But thank you for reiterating it.

BART BOSWINKEL: It's "removed from the assigned list as a result of the change."

NIGEL ROBERTS: Now, here's one little thing. And we have two people representing ccTLDs in this room that this affects. There are four ccTLDs that currently exist: .uk, .su, .ac, and .eu, which are not represented by official – if we use the right word, Jaap – code elements.

Now, in the interest of getting the work of this group forward, what I propose to do is, unless I hear violent objections, put the consideration of how retirement for those code elements – see how easy it is? – for those ccTLDs on one side and we work through the process for all the other ccTLDs. Once that’s clear, I think it might become clear how, for exceptional ccTLDs, if you don’t mind me making a portmanteau term, Nick...

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I agree with that, Nigel.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Colleague from .su?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think – sorry for my nervousness. I’m a newbie here.

NIGEL ROBERTS: No, you’re very welcome. Carry on.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think we should pay attention to the zone community; for example, for .su. .su has very much different business and scientists and other projects. If we retired that zone, what should we do with all of their domains? I, as a ccTLD registrar,

don't understand. They will have legacy compliance and so on. What should we do with that? We have no other options, only to forward it to ICANN because we have to answer how they do with their domains. I really don't understand what we do in that situation.

Now I think that our process of retirement should be initiated for the domains that have not been in business and have no life. It's already dead. I think that domains that have a huge amount of life in domains should have different conditions of retirement or should have some exceptional points. That's my question.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Thank you for their comments. They're actually well-received. This group is well-aware of – I think .yu is possibly a particular example – perhaps what might be regarded as an unseemly hurry on the part of the ICANN Board or ICANN in general to want to move along towards retirement. The purpose of this group is to actually examine of these issues and come up with solutions that are reasonable and equitable to the domain holders, to the registry, to the local Internet community, and to the global Internet community.

The proposal that I was asking for your opinion was that we take the four exceptional ccTLDs – .uk, .su, .ac, and .eu, which are not represented by code elements –

SIRI: I'm not sure [inaudible]

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah. That just tells you that Siri speaks to me in German.

SIRI: [inaudible]

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah, of course that has totally thrown me. That we take these four cases and do not look at them now – that means we'll be status quo as far as you're concerned – while we consider this and that we consider properly the application of the triggering events and the retirement process to all the other ccTLDs first. Then, when we've got clarity on that, we can come back and look at what the situation is in regards to those.

There's no immediate prospect of .uk being retired, but you never know. Isn't that right, Nick?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Not immediately.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Does that help?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. Thank you for this notice. I appreciate it.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah. Okay. Just conferring with Bart, I think we need to focus on this document and go and do some work on it. Keeping in mind that we're close to our soft stop, unless anybody wants to pick up one or the other agenda items, I think this is a good place to start to wrap up.

Can we therefore move to Any Other Business? I know I was going to give you an opportunity to speak in Any Other Business, but I suspect that that was probably what you were going to say in AOB – what you've just said. Is that right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

NIGEL ROBERTS: Do you want to add anything more? That's what I'm saying.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sorry. I missed something here.

NIGEL ROBERTS: We're on Any Other Business (AOB), and I was going to give you an opportunity to say something about .su under Any Other Business. But I think you've already given some of that. If you have any additional remarks, we want to hear them.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, I haven't. Sorry. I have no additional remarks.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay. Now, does anybody else have something under AOB (Any Other Business)?

Bart, any housekeeping?

BART BOSWINKEL: Until now, we've had the six-hour rotation of calls. The FOI used to have an eight-hour rotation of calls – again, to share the pain. But six hours affects you twice, effectively.

So the question is whether you want to stay with the six hours or do the eight-hour rotation. That's one. And then the frequency of the meetings – every two weeks again? – and when you want to start your first meeting, post-ICANN60.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Any opinions on this? Debbie?

DEBBIE MONAHAN: Us Kiwis are used to getting up or staying up for these sorts of calls, but I think it's been very obvious that people around the European regions are quite so used to the 1 a.m.'s. The level of participation in those I think is quite low.

I think, to be practical, moving to an eight-hour call might actually help, meaning that you're not going to get the real lows which we did get when I was in my ideal time zone and other people were not.

So depending on where you start that eight-hour, I can live with it.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Barrack, you were going to say something?

DEBBIE MONAHAN: And I prefer Sauvignon Blanc or a gin and tonic by way of payment.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Or both.

DEBBIE MONAHAN: Or both. [inaudible]

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you, Chair. I think the eight-hour would be better because the current system is 3 a.m. for us. About 5 or 6 a.m. is a bit more tolerable.

BART BOSWINKEL: [inaudible] start at 3 a.m. [inaudible].

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay. Next one the list is Patricio. If you want to speak to this, that [inaudible], put your hand up.

PATRICIO POBLETE: From I remember, FOI was less painful than this one, so I would prefer the eight-hour rotation.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Well, unless I can see some violent objections in the other direction, I think we're beginning to get some form of unanimity here.

What about on the other questions? Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Continuing on an every-two-weeks basis, I assume. The first meeting to start again – the date is not correct. What is the... Go ahead, Kim.

KIM DAVIES: I'm fine with that, but the holiday season is coming up soon. Do you have a plan for the regularity throughout late December/early January?

BART BOSWINKEL: I'll be on holiday between Christmas and the New Year as well, for two week. So unless you want to continue without me, I'm fine.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay. There's a couple of weeks to get up a schedule with that. So two weeks and the eight-hour. Bart, anything else?

BART BOSWINKEL: The starting date. In two weeks?

NIGEL ROBERTS: Does that work for everybody? In two weeks' time? I see no apologies.

DEBBIE MONAHAN: I'll send my apologies. But [inaudible] my apologies I'll record now.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay. Then that's a decision, too: in two weeks. Kim or Bart, do we have anything else before I close the meeting?

Well, thank you all very much for coming. It's been very productive. I look forward to seeing you on the call.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]